A

Key for Catholicks,

To open the Jugling of the Jesuits, and satisfie all that are but truly willing to understand, whether the Cause of the Roman or Reformed Churches be of God; and to leave the Reader utterly unexcusable that after this will be a Papist.

Containing some *Arguments* by which the meanest may see the Vanity of Popery; and 40 *Detections* of their *Fraud*; with Directions, and Materials sufficient for the Confutation of their Voluminous Deceits: particularly refelling *Boverius*, *Richlieu*, *H. T's. Manual*, some Manuscripts, *&c.*

With some Proposals for a (hopeless) Peace.

The second Edition much Corrected and Augmented.

By *Rich. Baxter* a Catholick Christian, and Pastor of a Church of such at *Kederminster.*

London, Printed, for *Nev: Simmons*, at the *Prince's Arms* in St. *Pauls* Church-yard. 1674.

Reader,

IF thou come hither with a practical esteem of Truth, desiring to know it that thou maist obey it, and with an humble mind dost study and pray to the Father of Lights, and art impartially willing to receive the Truth in the Love of it that thou maist be saved, and with diligence and meekness to read and weigh the Evidences that I bring thee, thou art then the person to whom I recommend these Papers with confident expectation of success. The Controversies here handled are those that have made, and still are making, the greatest combustions in the Christian world. And yet to almost all men of learning on both sides they seem exceeding easie. I seldom meet with a Learned Protestant but taketh Popery for such transparent fallacies, that he is little or no whit troubled with any doubtings in the business: And I seldom meet with a Learned Papist but is as confident on the other side, as if besides them, all the Christian world were blind and mad. Interest and prejudice must needs do much then on one side at least. And which side hath the greatest worldly interest to byas their understanding, is soon discerned by one that knows the Papal powor, their Cardinals, Prelates,

and the Riches, Honours and priviledges of their Clergy, and that knows our ſtate. And if thou wilt hear the Reaſons of the confidence of both ſides, I I will tell it thee here as briefly and plainly as I can.

We are confident of our own Religion, becauſe we believe the Goſpel: and we have no other Rule and Teſt of our Religion: And we are confident that Popery is a deceit, becauſe we both believe the Goſpel and the judgement of the ancient and preſent Churches, and becauſe we believe our ſenſe it ſelf: As ſure as we know Bread from Fleſh, and Wine from Blood, by ſeeing, taſting, &c. ſo ſure know we that Popery is falſe. And if a Controverſie is not at an End when it is brought to the judgement of all the ſenſes of all the ſound men in the world (it being about the object of ſenſe) then we are paſt hope of ending controverſies: And therefore as we will not waſt our time with every fellow that will diſpute with us that Snow is black, or the Fire cold, no more will we trouble our ſelves with theſe men that tell us that Bread is not bread, and Wine is not wine.

And if you would know the Reaſons of the confidence of the Papiſts, I know no more of them but what their Writings and ſpeeches do expreſs, and thoſe I have hereafter given you. Two things they are ſtill harping on: the firſt is, that in our way we have no aſſurance that the Chriſtian Religion is true, or that Scripture is the word of God. *Save me the labour of repetitions, and read*

but

but what I have written in the Preface to the ſecond Part of the Saints Reſt (Edit. 2. &c.) *where I give you the Reſolution of our faith, and in my* Safe Religion, Diſp. 3. *but eſpecially in my* Reaſons of the Chriſtian Relig. *and in a ſmall tract lately publiſhed againſt them, called* The Certainty of Chriſtianity without Popery, *and then believe them if thou canſt.*

Their ſecond is, that thred-bare Queſtion [Where was your Church before *Luther?* Where hath it been ſucceſſively in each age?] *And here meer Sophiſtry carryeth it through the Papal world, to the deluding of the ſimple that will be catcht with chaffe, and are not able to ſee* Things *for* Names. *I have dealt with ſome of them that harped on this ſtring, and never met with any thing from them that ſhould ſeem conſiderable to a diſcerning man, ſave only the two unanſwerable arguments of* Confidence (*that I ſay not* Impudence) *and* Loquacity. *Though I have more fully ſhamed this Queſtion in this Book, and have fully handled it in my* Diſput. *with Mr.* Johnſon *of the* Viſibility of the Church (*whoſe Rejoynder I think not worthy of an anſwer, while any work more worthy of my life and labour beſpeaketh my time,*) *I will here alſo give you at the entrance, a ſhort view of the caſe.*

The men that ask us, where our Church and Religion was, either know not (through ignorance) or will not let others know what our Church and

Religion is. [Shew us (*ſay they*) a Church in all ages that held the thirty nine Articles, or that held all that the Proteſtants hold, or elſe they were not Proteſtants.] *For ſooth, we muſt receive* from them *a Definition of a Proteſtant, and then we muſt prove the ſucceſſion of ſuch. Know therefore before you diſpute about the ſucceſſion, what is the thing whoſe ſucceſſion is queſtioned.* [A Proteſtant is a Chriſtian that holdeth to the holy Scriptures as the ſufficient Rule of faith and holy living, and proteſteth againſt Popery.] *The Proteſtant Churches are Societies profeſſing the Proteſtants Religion.* [The Proteſtant Religion] *is an improper ſpeech; but* [the Proteſtants Religion] *is a phraſe that we ſhall own. For* [Proteſtancy] *is not our Religion it ſelf, but the Rejection of Popiſh corruptions of Religion or defiling Additions. If my Rejections of other mens Additions be themſelves Additions, then is it in the power of any Heretick in the world to force me to Add to my Religion at his Pleaſure. A thouſand new Articles and Forms of Worſhip he may deviſe, and then muſt I add to my Religion by rejecting them all: even as I add to my Apple by wiping the dirt off it, or to my Cloaths, by bruſhing them. The Proteſtants Religion is only the Chriſtian Religion, the naked Chriſtian Religion alone: The Papiſts is the Chriſtian Religion corrupted with abundance of additions. The Proteſtants ever diſavowed any Confeſſions of men as pretended to be the Rule or*

Law

Law of their Religion. [The Protestants Religion is the Holy Scriptures alone:] *The Papists Religion is all that is decreed by the Pope and Councils. Our Religion contained in the Scripture hath its Essentials and Integrals. All the Essentials and as much of the Integrals as (in the use of means) we are able to understand, we believe particularly and explicitely: the rest we believe generally and implicitely to be all true. And I beseech the Reader to remember that the Essentials of our Religion are only the Baptismal Covenant, expounded in the Creed, Lords Prayer and Decalogue (as opened by Christ,) the summaries of things to be* Believed, Willed *and* Done; *Baptism being our* Christening, *and appointed by Christ himself and used by the primitive Church, for the true and sufficient symbol of our faith, to put men into Right and Possession of Church Communion: And the departing from this test or symbol made by Christ himself for this use, is the lacerating of the Churches. But the whole Scriptures contain more, even the Integrals and Accidentals of our Religion.*

So that as the Papists will not give us leave to take the writings of Gretser, Bellarmine *or any of their Doctors, yea the Articles of their Divines at* Thoren, Ratisbone, &c. *to be therefore Articles of their faith, but only those that are contained in General Councils approved by the Pope; so we require the same justice of them that they call Nothing the Articles of our Faith, but what is contained in the said*

ſummaries and in the Holy Scripture, which is the only Rule of our entire Religion. Do they know our Religion better than we do? This is our Religion, and this we ſtand to; in the Eſſentials and the Integrals.

Well! Conſider now whether any thing be eaſier than for a Proteſtant to ſhew you a viſible Church that hath ſucceſſively been of his Religion.

1. *The Chriſtian Religion hath been in all ages ſince Chriſt in viſible Societies: The Religion of Proteſtants is the Chriſtian Religion: therefore the Religion of Proteſtants hath been in all ages ſince Chriſt in viſible Societies.*

2. *That Religion which is contained in the Holy Scripture as its Rule or ſufficient Revelation, hath been profeſſed in all ages in viſible Churches. But the Religion of Proteſtants is contained in the Holy Scriptures as its Rule or ſufficient Revelation: therefore the Religion of Proteſtants hath been profeſſed in all ages in viſible Churches.*

We name the Societies, from the places of their reſidence: Our Church (as Auguſtine *tells the Donatiſts) begun at* Hieruſalem, *and thence was diſperſed into* Aſia, Africa *and* Europe; *it hath continued in* Syria, Æthiopia, Ægypt, India, Greece, &c. *If I could name but one Nation that had been of my Religion, I ſhould ſuſpect it were not the true Religion. It is the Chriſtian world that is inſtead of a Catalogue to us.*

O but, *ſay the Juglers,* This is a General anſwer,

ſwer, to ſay you are Chriſtians: there are more ſorts of Chriſtians than One. *I Reply*; *It is the General or Catholick Religion and Church that we are ſpeaking of*; *and therefore if it were not ſuch a General anſwer, it were not pertinent to the Queſtion: There are no more ſorts of true Chriſtians but* One; *that is, there is no Eſſential difference among them*; *but there is a gradual, integral and modal difference. But may not Chriſtians of ſeveral Degrees of Knowledge be in the ſame Catholick Church? Our queſtion is not,* [*Where any Sect, or any particular Church hath had its ſucceſſion:*] *but* [*where that Catholick Church hath been, of which we are members.*] *And ſurely Chriſt hath but* One Catholick Church.

O but, ſay they, would you make men believe that *Ethiopians*, *Armenians*, *Greeks*, &c. are Proteſtants? you may be aſhamed of ſo groſs a fiction.

I anſwer, Is it the Name *of* Proteſtants, *or their* Religion, *that you would have us prove a ſucceſſion of? Theſe deceivers cheat abundance of poor ſouls by this one device, even ſuppoſing that the word* [Proteſtant] *doth denominate our Church from its Eſſential parts, and ſo call for a Catalogue of Proteſtants. But I would ask them, whether we or they do better know our Religion? and conſequently what a Proteſtant is? If they know it at all, it is from our writings or expreſſions? For ſure they will not pretend without ſigns to know our hearts,*

and

and that better than our ſelves. You muſt take it from us, if you will know what our Religion is, as we muſt take it from you, if we will know yours. And therefore delude not ſilly ſouls by perſwading them that you know what our Religion is better than we. If you will believe our Books that tell you, believe our ſayings alſo, and believe me that here tell you my own Religion, [*A Proteſtant is a Chriſtian that proteſteth againſt Popery:*] Chriſtianity *is our Religion;* Proteſting againſt Popery *is our Negation or Rejection of your Corruptions of Religion. Men that never heard of the name of Papiſt or Proteſtants, may be of the ſame Religion with us. If many Nations of the world never received Popery, and we reject it; if they never knew it, and we know it and diſown it, are we not both of one Religion, even in the Integrals? One man never heard of the Leproſie; another catcheth it and is cured of it; and a third flyeth from it and preventeth it; And I think all theſe are truly men; yea and* (in tantum) found *men. When you call to us for a proof of our ſucceſſion, either you mean it, of the Eſſentials of our Religion and Church, or of the Negation of your Corruptions: Either you mean it of the points that we are Agreed in, or of thoſe we differ in.* Chriſtianity *is it that we are Agreed in; and that is our Religion, and nothing but that: Proteſtancy as ſuch, is but our wiping off the dirt, or curing the ſcab that you have brought upon our Religion. Is he not a man as well*

as

as you that will not tumble with you in the dirt, or come into your Pesthouse? If we know not our own Religion, then we cannot tell it you; and then you cannot know it: And if we do *know it, believe us when we profess our own Belief: We still profess before men and Angels, that we own no Religion but the Christian Religion, nor any Church but the Christian Church, nor dream of any Catholick Church but one, containing all the true Christians in the world, united in Jesus Christ the Head. We protest before men and Angels that it is the Holy Scriptures that are the Law and Rule and Test of our Religion; And why are we not to be Believed in this our own Profession, as well as you are in yours, when you make the Decrees of Popes and Councils to be your Law and Rule and Tests?*

We perform therefore more than you demand. You ask us Where was our Church before *Luther? And we answer, Where our Religion was. You ask us,* Where was that? *and we tell you* Where *ever the* Christian Religion *was, and the Holy Scriptures were received. This were enough for us in answer to your Question: But we do more: We tell you not only where our Church and Religion was, but where there were men that owned not your grand Corruptions, no more than we. What can you demand more of us, when you call for a succession of Protestants, than that we tell you of a succession of* Christians *(which are of our Religion) and* which were no Papists, *yea against Popery,*

(which

(*which therefore were of our* integrity?) *And who knoweth not that the foresaid* Abassines, Armenians, Ægyptians, Greeks, *&c. are against your Papal Soveraignty, Infallibility, and all that is by us renounced as* Essential *to Popery, though not against every one of your errours?*

O but, *say the Juglers*, these are not Protestants; they differ from you in many particulars. *I answer, Call them by what name you please; they are not only* Christians, *but also* Anti-papists, *or free from Popery, and then they are of our Religion and Church. But indeed, must the world be made believe that all that we believe is* essential *to our Religion, and that no man that differeth from us can be of our Religion, be the difference never so small? Read* Veron's *Rule of faith, who will not endure your own opinions to be called your Faith.*

But say they, tell us of a Church that professes your 39 Articles. *Silly deceivers! Do not those very Articles profess that* [The Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to Salvation.] Art. 6. *We never took these Articles instead of the Scripture, but the Articles and all Protestants profess the Scripture to be the only entire Rule and Test of their Faith and Religion. The substance of the 39 Articles may easily be proved to have*

have been ſucceſſively held by the Church from the beginning: but it is not incumbent on us to prove that every word in the writings of every Divine, or Church, hath been ſo continued; no more than you will own the writings of any Divines or Provincial Synods of your own, as being the Rule of your Faith. As you profeſs that the Decrees of Popes and general Councils approved by him, beſides the Scriptures, are the Rule and Teſt of your Religion; ſo do we profeſs that the Scriptures alone (with the Law of Nature) is the Rule of ours.

But, what! (*ſay they*) will you be of the ſame Church with *Neſtorians*, *Eutychians*, and other Hereticks? *I Anſwer* 1. *We will not take all for* Neſtorians, *or* Eutychians, *that a railer can call ſuch, that never knew them, nor can prove it.* 2. Hereticks indeed *that deny any eſſential part of Chriſtianity, are no Chriſtians, and therefore none of the Church that we are of: but if you will call thoſe Hereticks that have all the eſſentials of Chriſtianity, becauſe they err in leſſer points, we know that there are ſuch in the Catholick Church. We will be none of them our ſelves, if we can eſcape it (yet indeed have no hope of eſcaping all errour till we are perfect in knowledge:) But we will not run out of the family of God, becauſe there are children and ſick perſons in it: Nor will we forſake the Catholick Church becauſe there are erring perſons in it.*

O but, *ſaith the Papiſt*, We acknowledge not your

your distinction of points Essential and not Essential; all points of Faith are Essential with us, and of necessity to Salvation. *Answ. Reader, thou shalt see here such impudent and faithless jugling, as may make thee blush to think that Christianity hath such professors.* 1. *The Outside of their assertion damneth no less than all the world (that live to the use of Reason.)* 2. *The Inside of their deceitful meaning is almost clean contrary, and leaveth Heathens and Infidels in the Church, or in a state of salvation as well as Christians.* 3. *It leaveth no one Article of faith essential to a Christian, or to one that shall be saved; and leaveth the Church an Invisible thing, clean contrary to their own assertions of its Visibility.* 4. *And when they have thus wrangled themselves into a wood of Contradictions and Unchristian absurdities, the wisest of them say as we say, in the main point. All this I will now manifest to thee.*

1. *The* Out-side *of their assertion is, that Every point that we are bound to believe by a Divine faith, is fundamental, or essential to Christian faith, or of necessity to salvation. And if so, then no man breathing can be saved: For no man knoweth all that he is bound to know. And no man believeth that which he understandeth not: It is impossible to believe that such a Proposition is a truth distinctly and actually, when I understand not what the Proposition is. And that we all know but in part, even what we are obliged to know, no*

man

man will deny, but he that is mad by pride or faction. All that God hath revealed in his word, is the matter of our faith: There is no man can say, I have no culpable ignorance of any one Truth of God that I should believe. Had we been more perfect in our diligent studies, and prayers, and use of all means; and had we never sinfully grieved the spirit that should illuminate us, (to say nothing of our Original sinful darkness,) there is not one of us but might have known more than we do. If sin of the will and life be consistent with true faith, then some sin in the understanding is consistent with faith. But the former is true: therefore, &c. *But according to the out-side of their doctrine, no man that hath any sinful ignorance (and consequently unbelief) in his understanding can be saved; that is, no man in the world. If he that thinks he knoweth any thing, knoweth nothing as he ought to know,* 1 Cor. 8. 2. *what shall be said of these men, that think they and all the Church do know all things that they ought to know, and that their understandings have no sin? And must we needs be of that faith that damneth all men, and of that Church where none are saved?*

2. *As the Out-side of their Assertions is made for a bug-bear to frighten fools, so that the* Inside (*as expounded by many of them*) *is that Heathens and Infidels may be of their Church or saved, and that nothing of the Christian faith at all is necessary to salvation, is plain: For they tell*

tell us that they mean, that all points are of neceſſity, where they are ſufficiently propoſed, and mens ignorance is not invincible; but where there is no ſufficient propoſal, but mens ignorance is invincible, or ſuch as comes not from a wilful neglect of means, there no ignorance of the articles of faith is damnable, and ſo no article abſolutely neceſſary: So that the queſtion indeed is not Whether men believe or not? but whether they are Unbelievers or Heathens or ignorant perſons, by a wilful neglect of ſufficiently propoſed Truth, or not? So that all that part of the Heathen or Infidel world (O how great!) that have no ſuch propoſals of the Goſpel, may not only be ſaved, but be better and ſafer than moſt Chriſtians (if not all) who certainly are ſinfully ignorant of ſome truth which they ought to know.

Obj. But (*ſay they*) it will not ſtand with faith to deny belief to God in any thing, ſufficiently revealed; for he that believeth him in one thing, believeth him in all.

Anſw. *Very true, if they know it to be the Word of God. And if this be all, the Proteſtants are ready to averr upon their moſt ſolemn Oaths, that they believe every thing without exception which they know to be a Divine Revelation: and no wonder; for ſo doth every man that believes that there is a God, and that he is no lyar. If this will ſerve your turn, you have no more to ſay againſt us; your mouths are ſtopt. But may it not ſtand with faith*

faith to be ignorant, and that through ſinful neglect, of ſome revealed truth of God, or of the meaning of his word? If you are ſo proud as to think that all the juſtified are perfect and have no ſin, yet at leaſt conſider whether a man that liveth in Heatheniſm till fourſcore years of age, and then turns Chriſtian, is not afterward ignorant through his former ſinful negligence? But dare you ſay that you have no ſinful ignorance to bewail? Will you confeſs none, nor beg pardon, nor be beholden to Chriſt to pardon it?

That they make no point *of faith neceſſary, while they ſeem to make* all *neceſſary, ſee but what I have after cited from* Fr. à S. Clara, probl. 15, 16, 17, *and abundance more that are mentioned there by him.*

3. *And that by this Protean jugling,* they make the Church inviſible, *is apparent. For what man breathing knoweth the ſecrets of the ſouls of others, whether they have* reſiſted *or* not reſiſted *the light? and whether they are ignorant of the articles of faith upon ſinful contempt, or for want of ſome due means of faith, or internal capacity, or opportunity? We are as ſure that all men are ignorant of ſome thing that God hath revealed to be known (in nature and Scripture) as that they are men: But now whether any one of theſe men be free from thoſe aggravations of his ignorance (and that in every point) upon which the Papiſts make him an unbeliever, is unknown to others: When the Faith*

or Infidelity of men, and ſo their being in the Church or out of it, muſt not be known by the Matter of Faith which they profeſs, but by the ſecret paſſages of their hearts, their willingneſs or unwillingneſs, reſiſtance or not reſiſtance, and ſuch like, the Church then is inviſible*; no man can ſay which is it, nor who is of it: He that profeſſeth not the Faith, may be a Catholick; and he that profeſſeth it, for ought they know, may be an Infidel, as being ſinfully yet ignorant of ſome one truth that is not in his expreſs confeſſion: Thus by confuſion the builders of* Babel *marr their work.*

4. *And that the wiſeſt of them, ſay in the main as we ſay, ſee here in ſome proofs.* Bellarm. de Verbo Dei, lib. 4. cap. 11. [In the Chriſtian Doctrine both of Faith and Manners, ſome things are ſimply neceſſary to ſalvation to all; as the Knowledge of the Articles of the Apoſtles Creed, of the ten Commandements, and of *ſome* Sacraments: The reſt are not ſo neceſſary, that a man cannot be ſaved without the explicite Knowledge, belief and profeſſion of them—— Theſe things that are ſimply neceſſary and are profitable to all, the Apoſtles preached to all —— All things are Written by the Apoſtles which are Neceſſary to *all*, and which they openly preacht to all.] *See the place.*

Coſterus Enchirid. c. 1. p. 49. [Non inficiamur præcipua illa fidei capita quæ omnibus Chriſtianis cognitu ſunt ad ſalutem Neceſſaria, perſpicuè ſatis eſſe Apoſtolicis ſcriptis comprehenſa:] That is;

[We

[We deny not that those Chief Heads of the Faith which are to all Christians necessary to be known to salvation, are perspicuously enough comprehended in the Writings of the Apostles.] *Judge by these two (to spare the trouble of citing more) whether they be not forced after all their Cavils, to say as we, in distinguishing of Articles of Faith. And they cannot be ignorant, that the Church hath still had Forms of Profession, which were called her* Symbols, *as being the Badge of her Members; and did not suspend all upon uncertain conjectures about the frame and temper of the Professors minds.*

But if indeed it be not the want of Necessary Articles of Faith that they accuse us of, but the want of willingness or diligence to know the truth, let them prove their accusations, and let those persons that they prove guilty bear the blame. Do they think we would not as willingly know the truth as they? and that we do not pray as earnestly for Divine illumination? Do we not read their Books? (I verily think incomparably more than they do ours;) and are we not willing to confer with the wisest of them that can inform us? I have often privately and publickly desired that if any of them can say more than all these Schoolmen, Fryars and Jesuites say, which I have read, they would let me hear it, that I may want no means they can afford me for my fuller information.

But yet they have not done with us. When we prove a succession of our Religion, by proving a succession

ceſſion of ſuch as adhered to the Scriptures, which are the Doctrine of our Religion (an Argument that no Papiſt under heaven can confute,) they vainly tell us, that All Hereticks pretend to Scripture, and therefore that will not prove the point.

But 1. *Doth it follow that Scripture is not a ſufficient Rule of our Religion, becauſe Hereticks may pretend to it? You take the the* 39 *Articles for our Religion, and yet may Hereticks that are far from our minds, pretend to them. It's the liker to be the Rule becauſe all Hereticks pretend it, and would borrow credit from it to their Hereſies. The Law of the Land is the Rule of our Juſtice; and yet Lawyers and their Clients that are contrary to each other, do plead it for their contrary Cauſes. The Creed it ſelf is pretended by Arians for their Hereſie. What muſt we have no Rule or Teſt or diſcovery of our Religion which a Heretick can pretend for his impiety? What words of God or man are not capable of being miſinterpreted? If we ſhould give you every day a confeſſion of Faith, ſome Hereticks might pretend to hold the ſame: No wonder then if they do ſo by the Scriptures.*

2. *And can any Learned Papiſts be ſo ignorant, as not to know that the Arians pretended the Authority of General Councils? and ſo do many other Hereticks; and that the Authority of Pope and Councils are frequently pretended for contrary opinions among them, and may be pretended by many an Heretick? And will they therefore grant that the*

the Decrees of Popes and Councils are no ſufficient diſcovery of their Faith? If Hereticks pretending to your Teſt *of Faith, diſprove not that to be* your Faith, *then Hereticks pretending to* our Rule *and Teſt of Faith (which is the Holy Scripture) is no proof that it is* not *our Rule of Faith.*

I do therefore conclude, that the Proof of a Succeſſion of ſuch Churches as have received the Holy Scriptures, is a valid proof of a ſucceſſion of Churches of our Religion, ſeeing we have no Religion (doctrinally) but the Holy Scriptures. And this as far as modeſty will permit, I challenge all the Jeſuites on Earth to confute with any ſolid Reaſons: yet adding that we do ex ſuperabundanti *prove a ſucceſſion alſo of Churches that never owned Popery; even the greateſt part of the Chriſtian world. But let theſe men themſelves but prove to us a ſucceſſion of their Church, even ſuch as they require of us; Let them prove that from the* Apoſtles days the Catholick Church *(or any one Congregation of twenty men) did hold all that now their Councils and Popes have Decreed, and are eſteemed Articles of their Faith, and I am contented to be their bond-ſlave for ever, or to bear a fagot, or be uſed by them as cruelly as their malice can invent, or flames or their ſtrappado's execute. In the* 15*th and* 16*th Detection I have more largely ſpoken to them of this point, to which I refer the Reader.*

In the very principal point of their Papal Soveraignty, *they have nothing but this groſs deceit*

to cheat the world with: The Roman *Emperours divers ages after Christ, did give the Bishop of* Rome *a Primacy in their Empire, and hence these men would perswade us, that even from Christ they have had a Soveraignty over all the Christian world. Wink but at these small mistakes, and they have won the Cause.* 1. *Suppose but Christs Institution to stand instead of the Emperours.* 2. *Suppose divers hundred years after Christ, to have been in the Apostles days.* 3. *Suppose Primacy to be Soveraignty or Universal Government.* 4. *But especially grant them, that the* Roman *Empire was all the Christian world; and then they have made good that part of their Cause.*

That there were many Nations without the reach of the Roman *Empire, that had received the Christian Faith, is past doubt.* Socrates lib. 1. c. 15. *saith* that *Thomas* chose *Parthia, Bartholomew* chose *India, Matthew Ethiopia,* to plant the Gospel in; but the middle *India* was not converted till *Constantines* days, by *Frumentius* and *Edesius*; and *Iberia* by a Maid. *So* Euseb. l. 3. c. 3. *tells us* of *Thomas* his Preaching to the *Parthians,* and *Andrew* to the *Scythians. Et in vit. Const. l.* 4. *c.* 8. that there were many Churches in *Persia, & cap.* 91. how *Constantine* wrote for them to the King. Godignus *and others of them maintain that the* Abassines *did receive the Gospel from the beginning. Besides* Scotland *and many other Countries that were not under the* Roman *Power.*

er. And none of these were Governed by the Pope.

These three Arguments against the Papal Cause, I shall here premise to more that follow.

Argum. 1. *If all that part of the Christian world that was out of the reach of the* Roman *Empire, did never submit to the Soveraignty of the Pope, then hath he not been successively (or at any time) the actual Head of the Universal Church: But the Antecedent is most certain: therefore so is the Consequent. I only except those Nations which had been formerly of the Roman Empire, and being by conquest broken off, continued their old customes in the Church: And a few inconsiderable borderers that gloried in the countenance and neighbourhood of so potent an Empire.*

How an old woman, the Emperours Mother of Habassia, *did baffle their Jesuites, by asking them* [*How it came to pass, if obedience to the Pope be necessary to salvation, that they never had heard from him till now?*] *I have told you after from themselves.*

If Primacy were Soveraignty, and Emperours and Councils were Gods, yet the Indians, Abassines, Persians, *and many more in the East, and the* Scots, *and* Irish, *and* Danes, *and* Swedes, *and* Poles, *and* Muscovites, *and most of* Germany *in the West and North, should be no subjects of the Pope.*

Argum. 2. *If the Rule and Test of the Faith of Papists never had a Real Being, or no succession from*

the Apostles, then their Faith and Church hath either no Real Being, or no such Succession: But the Antecedent is true: as I prove,

It is either General Councils, or Popes, or the Church Essential (as they use to call it, that is, the Whole Body) that is the Rule of their Faith. If it be General Councils, 1. *They had no being from the Apostles till the Council of* Nice; *therefore the Rule of the Papists Faith was then unborn.* 2. *Yea they never had a being in the world: There was never any thing like a General Council since the days of the Apostles to this day. The first at* Nice *had none, (save one* John *of* Persia, *who it's like was some persecuted Bishop that was fled, or rather one that lived in a Roman City near the Persians and did oversee some of them: or if one or two more it's not material), but the Bishops of the Empire, and out of the Western parts so few as was next to none: The following Councils, as* Constantinop. 1. &c. *were only out of one piece of the Empire: The Council of* Trent *I disdain to reckon among the modester pretenders to an Universality.*

2. *And if it be not General Councils, but the Pope that is the Rule of their Faith; then,* 1. *Their Faith hath been interrupted, yea and turned to Heresie and to Infidelity when the Pope hath so turned.* 2. *And why then do they tell our people, that they take not the Pope for the Rule of their Faith?*

3. *If*

3. *If it be the Major part of the Universal Church,* 1. *It's known that two to one are against them, or at leaſt the Greater part: therefore by that Rule their Faith in the Papal Soveraignty is falſe.* 2. *And yet it would be hard, if a man muſt be of no Belief, till he have brought the world to the pole for it.*

Argum. 3. *If all the ſtir that the Papiſts make in the world for the Papal Government be but to rob Chriſtian Princes and Magiſtrates of their Power, then are they but a ſeditious Sect: But the Antecedent is apparent. For there are but two ſorts of Government in the Church: The one is by the Word applyed unto the Conſcience, which worketh only on the willing; either by General exhortations as in Preaching; or by Perſonal application, as in Sacraments, Excommunication and Abſolution: And this is the work of the preſent Paſtors, and cannot be performed by the Pope: Nor would he be content with this, to govern Volunteers. The other is by Commands, that ſhall be ſeconded with force: And this is proper to the Magiſtrate. But if they will be deluded to give up their Crowns and Scepters to the Pope, let them ſtand as the objects of the compaſſion of Spectators.*

Much more than I have here given you, I had prepared of the Teſtimony of Antiquity againſt them. But here is more than they are able ſolidly to anſwer, and I was afraid of over-whelming the capacity of ordinary Readers. I underſtand

not

not the French *Tongue; but by the Teſtimony of Learned men that underſtand them, I am imboldned to a confidence, that the two famous Confutations of the great* Perron, *will ſtand to the perpetual ſhame of Popery, which none of them will be ever able to Reply to, without as great a diſhonour to their Cauſe, as will follow their not daring to Reply: I mean,* Blondell's *Book* De Primatu in Eccleſia, *(which overwhelms them utterly with the witneſs of Antiquity,)* & * Pet. Molinæus de Novitate Papiſmi. *But if any of the* Romaniſts *that dare not meddle with thoſe Champions, nor daſh themſelves upon thoſe Pillars, ſhall yet vouchſafe an Anſwer to this ſmaller work, I do hereby aſſure him, that if he will do it ſoberly in the fear of God, in a way of cloſe and ſolid Arguing, he will perform a task that will be very acceptable to me. But niblers, ſnarlers, cavillers, and ſenſleſs praters I ſhall contemn.*

* Which is now tranſlated into *Engliſh* by his Son.

Rich. Baxter.

The Contents.

Chap. 1. *Popery no way to Unity,* page 1
Chap. 2. *Directions for them that will deal with a Papist,* p. 5
Chap. 3. Argum. 1. *Against Popery, by which every honest godly man is secured from them,* p. 10
Chap. 4. The second Argument, p. 20
Chap. 5. Argum. 3. *That deposing Kings that will not exterminate us, and absolving Subjects from their Allegiance, and giving their Dominions to others, is an Article of the Papists Faith,* p. 22
Chap. 6. Argum. 4. *The Church of* Rome *unholy in its Essentials,* p. 27
Chap. 7. Argum. 5. *The Papists of more than One Church, yet each part pretending to be the Catholick Church,* p. 33
Chap. 8. Argum. 6. *The Church of* Rome *hath discontinued,* p. 39
Chap. 9. Argum. 7. *From sense; securing all men from Popery that will believe their eyes, or any of their or others senses,* —— p. 41. H. T's *frivolous answer refelled,* p. 43
Chap. 10. Detect. 1. *Prove them but guilty of one Error in Faith, and all Popery is confuted,* p. 48
Chap. 11. Detect. 2. *A Doctrine so contrary to Scripture and it self, cannot be free from Errour,* p. 50
Chap. 12. Detect. 3. *Agree on the way of proof, before you dispute: Papists will take neither Sense, Reason, Scripture, nor the Tradition or Judgement of the greater*

greater part of the Church for judge or proof, p. 52
Chap. 13. Detect. 4. *Understand what they mean, when they call to you for a Judge of Controversies. How far a Judge is necessary, and who,* p. 56
Chap. 14. Detect. 5. *They pretend, that in their way there is an End of Controversies, but in ours there is none; Detected,* p. 59
Chap. 15. Detect. 6. *Their boast of Unity, and reproaching us with Divisions, Detected,* p. 67
Chap. 16. Detect. 7. *Their confounding the Essentials and Integrals of Christianity Detected,* p. 81
Chap. 17. Detect. 8. *Their extolling the judgement of the Catholick Church Detected: It is against them,* p. 91
Chap. 18. Detect. 9. *Some of their deluding Ambiguities Detected. 1. In the word* [*Church.*] *2. In the word* [*Pope.*] *3.* [*A General Council.*] *Bring them to Define what they mean by these, and you break them,* p. 95
Chap. 19. Detect. 10. *Their Confounding 1. An humane Ordinance, and a Divine. 2. Meer Primacy with Soveraignty. 3. An alterable Order with an unalterable Essential, Detected,* p. 105
Chap. 20. Detect. 11. *The vanity of their pretending Tradition detected. How far we are for Tradition. Tradition confoundeth Popery,* p. 111
Chap. 21. Detect. 12. *Their pretence that the* Greeks *and all other Churches were once under the Pope, Detected,* p. 133
Chap. 22. Detect. 13. *Their plea that the Church of* Rome *is a True Church, and therefore we are Schismaticks for separating from it, Detected,* p. 134
Chap. 23. Detect. 14. *Their pretending to fixed Unity and settledness, and that we are at uncertainty, incoherent, and Changelings, Detected,* p. 138
Chap. 24. Detect. 15. *Their plea that our Church and Religion is new, and theirs old; and their calling for a Catalogue,*

Catalogue, and proof of the Succeſſion of our Church before Luther, *Detected; and our Church made known to them,* p. 150. *and vindicated from* H. Turbervile's *exceptions. Proved fully that perſons differing in points of Faith are Chriſtians, and of the ſame Church,* p. 162 &c. *And that the* Abaſſines, Armenians, Copties, Greeks, *&c. are of the ſame Church with us, proved.*

H. T's *proof of their Succeſſion confuted, to* p. 183

Chap. 25. Detect. 16. *Their jumbling all our differences together, and then making leſſer or common differences to be the Proteſtant Religion, Detected,* p. 183

Thirty two points of Popery named, which they are challenged to prove a Succeſſion of, with my promiſe to receive what is ſo proved, p. 184. H. T's *Arguments for the Succeſſion of their Doctrine confuted, to* p. 201

Papiſts have thoſe in their Church that differ in point of Faith, p. 201

No ſuch difference between us and the moſt of the Chriſtian world as can prove us not of the ſame Catholick Church, proved againſt H. T. *in the inſtances,* 1. *Of Invocation of Saints,* p. 203. 2. *Praying for the dead,* p. 207. 3. *Veneration or Adoration of Images, Croſs and Reliques,* p. 210. 4. *Tranſubſtantiation,* 5. *Satisfaction and Purgatory,* 6. *Of Faſts, Free-will,* &c.

Chap. 26. Detect. 17. *Their falſe interpretation of the ſayings of Ancients, from whence they would extort a proof of their Soveraignty, Detected in eight inſtances,* p. 219

Chap. 27. Detect. 18. *Their corrupting Councils and Fathers, and citing ſuch, Detected,* p. 229

Chap. 28. Detect. 19. *Their perſwading the people that we are all Lyars, that nothing we ſay and write may be regarded,* p. 236

Chap. 29. Detect. 20. *Their feigned Miracles:* p. 238

The ſtory of the Boy of Bilſon, p. 240

Chap.

Chap. 30. Detect. 21. *Their Impudent ſlanders. The horrid Lyes againſt* Luther *and* Calvin, *inſiſted on by the Marqueſs of* Worceſter, *and their common Writers, fully detected,* p. 245

Chap. 31. Detect. 22. *Their quarrels at our Tranſlations of Scripture,* p. 260

Chap. 32. Detect. 23. *Their deſign to make the Miniſters odious to the people. Their riches and ours compared,* p. 261

Chap. 33. Detect. 24. *Their cavils againſt our Miniſtry, Ordination and Succeſſion, confuted,* p. 267

Chap. 34. Detect. 25. *Their pretence of the Holineſs of their Church, and the Unholineſs of ours: And* 1. *Of their Canonized Saints,* p. 278, 279. 2. *Of the ſtrictneſs of their Religious Orders.* 3. *Of their unmarryed Clergie,* 4. *Their Holy Ceremonies,* p. 225, 226.

Chap. 35. Detect. 26. *Their demanding of us to tell them when every one of their Corruptions did begin,* p. 304 *Their Novelty proved,* p. 305, *&c.*

A Confutation of a Papiſts M. S. *on this point, which was ſent to Mr.* Millard, *near* Sturbridge, p. 319

Chap. 36. Detect. 27. *They charge us with New Articles, for denying their New Articles of Faith, and then bid us prove the Succeſſion of our Negatives,* p. 337

Chap. 37. Detect. 28. *They conclude that theirs is the ſafer Religion, becauſe it is moſt uncharitable and damneth others, and ours the leſs ſafe becauſe the more charitable,* p. 341

They admit or ſave Heathens while they would damn Proteſtants, proved, p. 345

Chap. 38. Detect. 29. *They win the Great ones and multitude by ſuiting their Doctrine and Worſhip to the fleſhly conceits and inclinations of ungodly men,* p. 354 *ſhewed in twenty inſtances.*

Chap. 39. Detect. 30. *They pick up the miſtakes or harſh paſſages*

passages of some particular Divines, and perswade men that these are the Protestant Religion, p. 364
A Confutation of Cardinal Richlieu's *twelve Accusations or Arguments against the Protestants,* p. 265, 266, *&c.*
Chap. 42. Detect. 33. *Their pretence of a Divine institution, and Natural Excellency of a visible Monarchical Government of the whole Church Detected,* p. 387
An Answer to the ridiculous Reasons of Card. Boverius *to Prince* Charles, p. 387
Chap. 43. Detect. 34. *Their new device of receiving nothing as Scripture Evidence, but the expres's words,* p. 400
Chap. 44. Detect. 35. *They choose such persons to dispute with, against whom they have some notable advantage,* p. 407
Chap. 45. Detect. 36. *Their designs to divide us, or sow Heresies among the Vulgar, and then draw them to some odious practices,* p. 409
Chap. 46. Detect. 37. *They Hide themselves (in their Agents and new Converts:) The means: Our danger by the Hiders: The Detection,* p. 412 to 423
Chap. 47. Detect. 38. *Their exceeding industry to pervert men of Interest and power,* p. 423
Chap. 48. Detect. 39. *Their Treasons against the lives of Princes and the Peace of Nations, and their dissolving the bond of Oaths and Covenants, and making Perjury and Rebellion to seem Duties and Meritorious,* p. 427. *proved from themselves; their recrimination about the late* Kings *death refelled,* p. 435
Chap. 49. Detect. 40. *Their last course is to turn to open Hostility, and stir up Princes to war and blood,* p. 437
Chap. 50. *Some Proposals to the Papists for a (Hopeless) Peace,* p. 447

ERRATA.

ERRATA.

PAg. 242. l. 1. r. *his head.* p. 333. l. 11. dele [,]. Also in the *Dialogue against Popery* (bound with this Book) these *Errata* gathered too late to be inserted are here amended. Pag. 15. l. 1. r. *the only.* p. 87. l. 10. r. *Natural Revelations.* p. 166. l. 29. r. *Empire, Arts.* The *Note* also in the *Marg.* of *p.* 2. should stand *p.* 3. over against *l.* 25. And that in *p.* 12. over against *l.* 11.

A

Key for Catholicks,

To open the juglings of the *Jesuits*, and satisfie all that are but truly willing to understand, whether the cause of the *Roman*, or the *Reformed Churches*, be of God: and to leave the *Reader* utterly unexcusable, if after this he will be a *Papist*.

CHAP. I.

THE thoughts of the divided state of Christians have brought one of the greatest and constantest sadness to my Soul, that ever it was acquainted with; especially to remember, that while we are quarrelling, and plotting, and writing, and fighting against each other, so many parts of the world (about five of six) remain in the Infidelity of *Heathenism*, *Judaism* or *Mahometanism*, where millions of poor souls do need our help; and if all our strength were joyned together for their Illumination and Salvation, it would be too little. Oh horrible shame to the face of *Christendom*, that the Nations are quietly

ſerving the Devil, and the Turk is in poſſeſſion of ſo many Countreys, that once were the Inheritance of Chriſt, and that his Iron-yoak is ſtill upon the necks of the perſecuted *Greeks*, and that he ſtands up at our doors in ſo formidable a poſture, ſtill ready to devour the reſt of the Chriſtian world; and yet that inſtead of combining to reſiſt him, and vindicate the cauſe and people of the Lord, we are greedily ſucking the blood of one another, and tearing in pieces the body of Chriſt with furious hands, and deſtroying our ſelves to ſave the enemy a labour, and ſpending that wit, that treaſure, that labour and that blood, to daſh our ſelves in pieces on one another, which might be nobly, and honeſtly, and happily ſpent in the cauſe of God.

Theſe thoughts provoked me to many an hours conſideration, How the wounds of the Church might be yet healed: And have made it long a principal part of my daily Prayers, that the Reconciling Light might ſhine from Heaven, that might in ſome good meaſure take up our differences; and that God would at laſt give healing Principles and diſpoſitions unto men, eſpecially to Princes and the Paſtors of the Church. But the more I ſtudied how it might be done, the more difficult, if not impoſſible it appear'd, and all becauſe of the *Roman* Tyranny; the Vice-Chriſt or pretended Head of the Church, being with them become an eſſential part of it, and the Subjection to him eſſential to our Chriſtianity it ſelf. So that (ſaith *Bellarmine de Eccleſ. l.* 3. *c.* 5.) *No man, though he would, can be a Subject of Chriſt, that is not ſubject to the Pope*; and this with abundance of intolerable corruptions they have fixed by the fancy of their own Infallibility, and built upon this foundation a worldly Kingdom, and the temporal Riches and Dignity of a numerous Clergy, twiſting ſome Princes alſo into the Intereſt; ſo that they cannot poſſibly

possibly yield to us in the very principal points of difference, unless they will deny the very Essence of their New Christianity and Church, and pluck up the foundations which they have so industriously laid, and leave men to a suspition that they are fallible hereafter, if they shall confess themselves mistaken in any thing now; and unless they will be so admirably self-denying, as to let go the temporal advantages which so many thousands of them are interested in: And whether so much light may be hoped for in so dark a generation, or so much love to God, and self-denyal in millions of men so void of self-denyal, is easie to conjecture: And we cannot in these *greatest* matters come over to them, unless we will flatly betray our Souls, and depart from the Unity of the Catholick Church, and from the Center of that Unity, to unite with another called the *Roman Catholick Church*, in another Center. And if we should thus cast away the Truth and Favour of God, and sin against our Knowledge and Conscience, and so prove men of *no Faith or Religion*, under pretence of desiring a *Unity* in Faith and Religion, yet all would not do the thing intended, but we should certainly miss of these very ends which we seek, when we had sold the Truth and our Souls to obtain them. For there is nothing more certain, than that the Christian World will never unite in the *Roman* Vice-Christ, nor agree with them in their Corruptions, against plain Scripture, Tradition, Consent of the antient Church, against the Reason and common sense of Mankind: This is not by any wise man to be expected. Never did the universal Church, or one half of it center to this day in the *Roman* Soveraignty: And why should they hope for that which never yet was done? When they had their Primacy of Place (to be the Bishop of the first Seat, and the first of the Patriarcks) it made the Pope no

more a Soveraign and a Vice-Christ, than the King of *France* is Soveraign to the *Duke* of *Saxony* or *Bavaria*; or than the Senior Justice on the Bench is the Soveraign of the rest: and yet even this much he never had but from the *Roman* Empire: What claim did he ever lay in his first Usurpations, to any Church without those bounds? It was the Empire that raised him, and the Empire limited his own Usurpations. Saith their own *Reinerius*, (or whoever else) *Cont. Waldens. Catal. in Biblioth. Patr. To.* 4. *pag.* 773. [*The Churches of the* Armenians, *and* Æthiopians, *and* Indians, *and the rest which the Apostles converted, are not under the Church of* Rome.] Yea in *Gregories* dayes, they found the Churches of *Britain* and *Ireland* both strangers and adversaries to their Soveraignty; insomuch as they could not procure them to receive their Government, nor change so much as the time of *Easter* for them, no nor to have Communion with them at last: *Anno* 614. *Laurentius* their Arch-Bishop here, wrote this Letter (with *Mellitus* and *Justus*) to the Bishops and Abbots in all *Scotland* [*While the Sea Apostolick after its manner directed us to preach to the* Pagan *Nations in these Western parts, as in the whole world; and we happened to enter this Island, called* Britain, *before we knew them, believing that they walked after the manner of the universal Church, we reverenced both the* Britains *and the* Scots *in great Reverence of their Sanctity. But when we knew the* Britains, *we thought the* Scots *were better. But we have learnt by* Daganus *the Bishop in this forementioned Island, and by* Columbanus *the* Abbot *coming into* France, *that the* Scots *do nothing differ from the* Britains *in their Conversation. For Bishop* Daganus *coming to us, refused not only to eat with us, but even to eat in the same House where we did eat.*] *Usher. Epist. Hibern.*

Hibern. 7. p. 18. (who taketh *Scotia* for *Ireland.*)

Our moſt peaceable Biſhop *Hall* was forct to write a [*Roma irreconciliabilis.*] While we are thinking of Reconciliation, they are about our ears with Plots and violence, and with ſwarms of *Rome-bred* Sects, and are day and night induſtriouſly undermining us; ſo that by their continual Alarms, I am called off to theſe defenſive wars which here I have undertaken; yet ſtill reſolving that the Deſperateneſs of the Cure ſhall not make me run from them into a contrary extream, nor be out of the way of Peace, nor neglect any neceſſary means, how hopeleſs ſoever of ſucceſs.

The Work that here I have undertaken, is, 1. To give you briefly thoſe Grounds on which you muſt go, if you will keep your ground againſt a Papiſt. 2. To give a few invincible Arguments, which the weakeſt may be able to uſe, to overthrow the principal grounds of the Papiſts. 3. To detect their Frauds, and give to the younger ſort of Miniſters, ſufficient Directions for the Confutation of all the Papiſts in the world. 4. To propound (though in vain) ſuch terms of Peace as we can yield to.

CHAP. II.

BEfore I mention the Grounds or Cauſe that you muſt maintain, I muſt premiſe this Advice to the Common People.

1. Wrong not the Truth and your ſelves by an unequal conflict. Enter not raſhly upon Diſputes with thoſe that are Learned and of nimble tongues, if you be ignorant, or of weak capacities your ſelves. Though I ſhall here ſhew you that Scripture, Church, Tradition, Reaſon and Senſe are on your ſide, yet experience tells us how the words of

Juglers have made millions of men deny belief to their eyes, taſte and other ſenſes. An ignorant man is ſoon ſilenced by a ſubtile wit; and many think that when they cannot anſwer, they muſt yield, though they deny both Senſe and Reaſon by it. If any of them ſecretly entice you, deſire them to debate the caſe with ſome able, learned, experienced Miniſter in your hearing. It is the office of your Paſtors to defend you from the Wolves: If you once deſpiſe them or ſtraggle from them and the Flocks, and truſt to your own Reaſon that is unfurniſhed and unprepared for ſuch work, you may take that you get by it, if you be undone. You need the help of Paſtors for your ſouls, as well as of Phyſitions for your Bodies, and Lawyers for your Eſtates: or elſe God would never have ſet them over you in his Church. Let them but come on equal terms, and you ſhall ſee what Truth can do. In this way we will not avoid a Conference with any of them. But alas! with ignorant unlearned people, what may not ſuch Deceivers do? that can perſwade ſo many thouſand ſouls to give no Credit to their own eyes, or taſte, or feeling, but to believe a Prieſt, that Bread is not Bread, and Wine is not Wine.

2. Yet I would have the weakeſt to endeavour to *underſtand* the *reaſons* of their Profeſſion, and to be *able* to repell Deceivers: And to that end, I ſhall here give you firſt ſome Directions concerning the cauſe which you muſt defend.

And concerning this, Obſerve theſe things following. 1. Underſtand what the *Religion* is that you muſt hold and maintain: It is the antient Chriſtian Religion. Do not put every Truth among the Eſſentials of your Religion: Our Religion doth not ſtand or fall with every Controverſie that is raiſed about it. That which was the true Religion in the Apoſtles

dayes

dayes is ours now: that which all were baptized into the Profession of, and the Churches openly held forth as their Belief. Reformation brings us not a new Religion: but cleanseth the old from the dross of Popery, which by innovation they had brought in. A man that cannot confute a Papist, may yet be a Christian, and so hold fast the true Religion. It followeth not that our Religion is questionable or unsafe, if some point in Controversie between them and us be questionable or hard. The Papists would fain bring you to believe that our Religion must lye upon some of these Controversies: but its no such matter. Perhaps you will say, *That then it is not about Religion that we differ from them.* I answer; yes: it is about the *Essentials* of their Religion, but it is but for the preserving the *Integrity of ours* against the Consequences and additions of theirs. They have made them a *New* Religion (which we call Popery) and joyned this to the *Old* Religion (which we call Christianity.) Now we stick to the old Religion alone; and therefore there is more essential to *their* Religion, than is to ours; so that our *own* Religion, even the *antient Christianity*, is out of Controversie between us. The Papists do confess that the Creed, the Lords Prayer, the ten Commandments are true, yea, that all the Scripture is the Word of God, and certainly true: so that our Religion is granted us as past dispute: And therefore it is only the Papists Religion that is in question between us, and not ours. If you will make those lower Truths to be of the Essence of your Religion which are not, you will give the Papists the advantage which they desire.

2. If the Papists call for a Rule, or Test of your Religion, and ask you where they may find it, assign them to the *Holy Scriptures*, and not to any Confessions of Churches, further than as they agree with that. We

know of no Divine Rules and Laws of Faith and Life, but the holy Scripture (and the hearts of Believers have an imperfect Transcript of them.) The Confessions of Churches are but part of the Holy Scripture, or Collections out of them, containing the points of greatest weight: And if in phrase or order (much more in matter) there be any thing humane, we make it not our Rule, nor are we bound to make it good, no more than the Writings of godly men. A point is not therefore with us an Article of Faith, because our Churches or a Synod put it into a Confession, but because it is in the Word of God. For a Councils determinations do with us differ but gradually from the Judgement of a single man, in this respect. And therefore we give them the Scripture only as the full Doctrine of our Faith, and the perfect Law of God; And those points in it, which Life or Death is laid upon, and God hath told us, we cannot be saved without, we take them as the Essentials of our Religion, and the rest as the Integrals only: The Essentials are the Baptismal Covenant, explained in the Creed, Lords Prayer and Decalogue.

If they ask, *Why then we do draw up Confessions of Faith?* I answer, 1. To teach and help the people by gathering to their hands the most necessary points, and giving them sometimes an explication of them. 2. To let our Accusers see that we misunderstand not the Scriptures. 3. To let Pastors and other Subjects know what sense of Scripture the Magistrate will own within his Dominions. 4. And to let the Pastors and the world know what sense in the principal Points we are agreed in. But still we take not our Confessions for our Divine Rule; and therefore if there be any error in a Confession, there is none in the Rule of our Religion, and consequently none in the Religion which we all agree

agree in; but only in such a persons or Churches exposition of the Rule, which yet among Christians is not in any essential Point.

3. Understand well what is the *Catholick Church*, that when the Papists ask you what Church you are of, or call to you to prove its antiquity or truth, you may give them a sound and Catholick answer. The Catholick Church is the whole number of true Christians upon earth (for we meddle not now with that part which is in Heaven.) It is not tyed to Protestants only, nor to the Greeks only, much less to the Romanists only, or to any other party whatsoever; but it comprehendeth all the members of Christ; and as visible, it containeth all that profess the Christian Religion by a credible profession. If the Christian Religion may be known, then a man may know that he is a Christian, and consequently a member of the Catholick Church. But if the Christian Religion cannot be known, then no man can know which is the Church, or which is a Christian. All Christians united to Christ the Head, are this Catholick Church. If you tye the Church to your own party, and make a wrong description of it, you will ensnare your selves, and spoil your belief, and your defence of it.

4. Run not into extreams: mix not any unsound principles with your Religion. For if you do, the Papists will cull out those, and by disgracing them, will seem to disgrace your Religion.

5. Use not any unsound Arguments to defend the Truth. For if you do, the truth will suffer, and seem to be overthrown by the weakness of your Arguments.

6. Joyn not with those men that cast out any Ordinance of God, because the Papists have abused it. Reformation of corrupted Institutions is not by the Abolition

Abolition of them, but by the Reſtauration of them. There are few things in uſe among the Papiſts themſelves as parts of worſhip, but may lead us up to a good original, or tell us of ſome other real Duty which did degenerate into theſe.

7. Joyn not with thoſe ignorant, unpeaceable, ſelf-conceited, womaniſh, rabious Divines, or private men, that pour out unworthy reproaches at godly men among our ſelves, as if they were Hereticks, or ſuch as the Churches ſhould diſ-own. For theſe are they that pleaſe the Papiſts, and harden them in their Error, and offend the weak. They think they may call us Hereticks or Blaſphemers by authority, when we call one another ſo. Such Railers teach them what to ſay, and play their game more effectually than they could do their own. When they are alluring the ſimple people, how ſoon will they prevail, if they can but prove their charge againſt us from the pens of Proteſtants themſelves?

Having told you on what grounds you muſt make good your cauſe againſt them, I ſhall next give you three or four eaſie Arguments (ſome of them formerly given you) by which even the weakeſt may prove that Popery is but deceit.

CHAP. III.

Argum. 1. *IF there be any godly honeſt men on earth beſides Papiſts, then Popery is falſe and not of God. But there be godly honeſt men on earth beſides Papiſts: therefore Popery is falſe, and not of God.*

The Major is proved thus. It is an Article of the Popiſh faith, that there are no godly honeſt men on earth, beſides Papiſts: therefore if there be any ſuch, Popery is falſe,

false, (By godly honest men, I mean such as have true love to God, and so are in a state of salvation.) The Antecedent I prove thus. 1. Their very definition of the Church doth make the Pope the Head, and confine the membership only to his subjects, making the Roman Catholick Church (as they call it) the whole. 2. But yet lest any ignorant Papist say, *I may be a Roman Catholick without believing that all others are ungodly, and shall be damned*, I will give it you in the Determination of a Pope and General Council. *Leo* the tenth, *Abrog. Pragm. sanct. Bull.* in the seventeenth General Council at the *Lateran*, saith [*And seeing it is of necessity to salvation, that all the faithful of Christ be subject to the Pope of* Rome, *as we are taught by the testimony of divine Scripture, and of the holy Fathers, and it is declared in the Constitution of Pope Boniface* 7, &c.] And Pope *Pius* the second was converted from being *Æneas Sylvius* by this Doctrine of a Cardinal, approved by him at large, *Bull. Retract.* in the Vol. 4. of *Binnius*, p. 514. [*I came to the Fountain of Truth, which the holy Doctors both Greek and Latine shew; who with one voice say, that he cannot be saved that holdeth not the unity of the holy Church of* Rome; *and that all those vertues are maimed to him that refuseth to obey the Pope of* Rome; *though he lye in sackcloth and ashes, and fast and pray both day and night, and seem in the other things to fulfill the Law of God.*] So that if a Pope and General Council be false, then Popery is false. For *their* infallibility is the ground of their faith, and they take it on their unerring authority. But if the Pope and a General Council be to be believed, then no man but a subject of the Pope can be saved: no, though he fast and pray in sack-cloth and ashes day and night, and seem to fulfill the rest of the Law of God. Its certain therefore that if any one of you that call your selves Roman Catholicks do not believe that all the world

shall

ſhall be damned ſave your ſelves, you are indeed no Roman Catholicks, but are Hereticks your ſelves in their account; for you deny a principal Article of their faith; and deny the Infallibility of the Pope with a General Council, which is your very Foundation.

And therefore we find that even in the great and charitable work of reducing the *Abaſſines*, the Jeſuite *Gonzalus Rodericus* in his ſpeech to the Emperours mother laid ſo great a ſtreſs on this point, that when ſhe profeſſed her ſubjection to Chriſt, he told her, that [*None are ſubject to Chriſt, that are not ſubject to his Vicar,*] [*Negavi Chriſto ſubjici qui ejus vicario non ſubjicitur.*] *Godignus de reb. Abaſſin. Lib.* 2. *c.* 18. in *Roderic. liter. p.* 323.

And *Bellarmine* ſaith *(de Eccl. l.* 3. *c.* 5.*)* that [*no man though he would can be ſubject to Chriſt that is not ſubject to the Pope*] that is, he cannot be a Chriſtian. And therefore *Card. Richlieu (* then Biſhop of *Luſſon)* tells the Proteſtants that they were not to be called *Chriſtians.* And *Knot* againſt *Chillingworth*, with abundance more of them, aſſerting that Proteſtants cannot be ſaved, do eaſily learn to practiſe this Leſſon of the Pope and Council. I come now to prove that your Pope, and Council, and Faith are falſe, and that others beſides you may be in a ſtate of Charity and Salvation. *(* For you confeſs your ſelves, that he that is in a ſtate of Charity, is in a ſtate of Salvation. *)*

1. *If a man may know his own heart, then there are others beſides Papiſts that are in Charity, and are godly men: (* and ſo in a ſtate of Salvation *)* But a *man may know his own heart:* therefore, *&c.*

The Conſequence of the Major is plain by inward experience to every godly, honeſt man that knoweth himſelf. If I can know my own heart, I muſt needs ſay, I love God, and am not void of ſincere Godlineſs and

and Honesty. And that I may know my own heart I can tell also by experience : For to know my own Knowledge and Will is an ordinary certain thing, if not by intuition it self. And if a man cannot know whether he believe and love God or not, then no man can give thanks for it, nor make Profession of it : nay, men cannot converse together, if they cannot know their own minds. And *Bellarmine* confesseth that we may have a moral Conjectural certainty that we have true Love, and are justified. And then I have a moral conjectural certainty at least, that Popery is false; because I have at least such a certainty that I am not ungodly or unjustified. So that look what measure of knowledge or perswasion any Protestant hath that he is truly honest and justified, that measure of knowledge must he needs have (if he understand himself) that Popery is a deceit.

So that from hence you may gather these four conclusions ; 1. *That all that have any knowledge or perswasion that they are not ungodly unjustified persons themselves, and void of the true Love of God, are quite out of danger from turning Papists,* if they understand but what Popery is ; and if they do not, they cannot turn to it, but in part.

2. *That never any honest godly man did turn Papist in the world* ; and this the Papists themselves will justifie : For they say (by a Pope and General Council) that no man can be saved but a Papist : and they generally hold, that all that have Charity and are justified, shall be saved if they so dye. So that if Popery be true, then no man had Charity or true Godliness before he was a Papist : and therefore never did one godly man or woman turn Papist. And therefore let them take the honour of their wicked seduced Ones. What glory is it to them that none ever turned to them but ungodly people ?

3. And

3. And it followeth that the *Papists do not so much as desire or invite any godly man to turn to them.* If you understand their meaning, they call you not to turn to them, if you are not ungodly persons.

4. And hence it follows, that every one that turneth Papist, doth thereby confess that he was a wicked man before, and that he had not the least true love to God; that he was not justified, but a graceless wretch.

In a word, all you that do but know or hope that you have any saving Grace, have an Argument here against Popery, which all the *Jesuites* in the world cannot confute. For you know your own hearts better than they: And they have no way to turn you to them, but by perswading you that you are not what you are, and that you know not what you know. So that plainly this is your Argument, [*I know, or I have good perswasions that I am not utterly void of Charity or saving Grace; therefore I know, or have the same perswasions that Popery is false, which determineth that none have Charity or saving Grace but Papists.*]

2. But I proceed to a further proof of the Minor: A man may have a very strong *Conjecture* that *many others* that are no Papists have saving Grace; though he had no perswasion that he hath such Grace himself. And consequently he must have as strong a conjecture that Popery is false. What abundance of holy heavenly persons have we known of all rancks among us! Such as have lived in daily breathings after God, spending no small part of their lives upon their knees, and in the serious and reverent attendance upon God in holy worship, meditating day and night upon his Law; hating all known sin, and delighting in holiness, and longing for perfection; and living in constant Temperance and Chastity, abhorring the very appearance of evil, and making conscience of an idle word or thought, devoting

devoting their lives and labours, and all they have to God, giving all their Estates (some of them) to pious and charitable uses, except what is necessary for their daily bread, even mean cloathing and food; taming their bodies, and bringing them into subjection, and denying themselves, and mortifying the flesh, and contemning all the Honours or Riches of the world, resolving to suffer death it self, (as many of their Brethren have done from the Papists) rather than sin wilfully against God and their consciences: in a word, living to God, and longing to be with him, and manifesting these longings to the very death; grieving more at any time, if they have but lost the sense and perswasions of the love of God, than if they had lost all the world; and would give a thousand worlds, if they had them, for more of the love of God in their souls, and fuller assurance of his Love and Communion with him. As far as words, and groans, and tears, and the very drift of a mans life, and the expending of all that he hath, can help us to know another mans heart, so far do we know all this by others, that have lived among us. And may we not conjecture, and be strongly perswaded that these, or some of these, or some one of these, was a holy justified person?

And now Reader, if ever thou be tempted to be a Papist, I will tell thee what a task thou hast: Look on one side on the Lives of holy men among us, such as was Mr. *Dodd*, Mr. *Paul Bayn*, Mr. *William Fenner*, Mr. *Arthur Hildersham*, Mr. *Robert Bolton*, Mr. *Greenham*, Mr. *Hooker*, Dr. *Sibbs*, Dr. *Preston*, Dr. *Stoughton*, Mr. *Perkins*, with many hundreds more; Besides blessed *Bradford*, *Glover*, *Sanders*, *Hooper*, and the rest that laid down their lives in the flames in testimony against Popery; besides all the thousands that in other Nations have dyed by the Papists hands, becaufe they durst not sin against

againſt God; and beſides all the Learned holy Divines of other Nations, and the millions of Godly Proteſtants there; as alſo look upon all the godly that are now living, men or women, that live in moſt earneſt ſeeking after God and ſerving him; look on thoſe about you, enquire of others; read the writings of holy Divines: and then remember, *you cannot turn Papiſt till you have concluded that all theſe are damned, and are utterly void of ſaving Grace and the Love of God*; If there be but one Proteſtant that you know, or any one of all that have been, that you take to be in a ſaving ſtate, you cannot poſſibly turn Papiſt, if you know what you do. For it is eſſential to Popery to contradict all this.

Nay, this is not all: but think of all the Greek Church that lyeth under the tyranny of the Turk, and of all the *Armenians*, and *Abaſſines*, and other Chriſtians in the world, that are more in number far than the Papiſts; and you muſt conclude, that *not one of all theſe are ſaved before you can be a Papiſt.* And is this an eaſie task to one that hath the heart of a man in his breaſt? If you are no true Chriſtians your ſelves, dare you conclude that not one of theſe are true Chriſtians? If you confeſs that you love not God your ſelves, dare you ſay that among the far greater part of the Chriſtians of the world, there is not one man or woman that loves God? This you muſt ſay if you will be a Papiſt.

And then on the other hand, Look on the words of Jeſus Chriſt, and ſee what thanks he will give you for ſuch a cenſure, Mat. 7. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. *Judge not, that ye be not judged: for with what judgement ye judge, ye ſhall be judged: and with what meaſure you mete, it ſhall be meaſured to you again. And why beholdeſt thou the mote in thy brothers eye, but conſidereſt not the beam that is in thine own eye?---Thou hypocrite! firſt caſt out the beam*

out

out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy Brothers eye.] Jam. 4. 12. *There is one Law-giver that is able to save and to destroy: who art thou that judgest another?*] Rom. 14. 1, 2, 3, 4, 10. [*Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations. For one believeth that he may eat all things, another who is weak eateth herbs: Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not: and let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him. Who art thou that judgest another mans servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth; yea he shall be holden up, for God is able to make him stand. One man esteemeth one day above another, another esteemeth every day alike: Let every man be fully perswaded in his own mind* —— *But why dost thou judge thy brother, or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? we shall all stand before the Judgement seat of Christ. For it is written, as I live saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God; so then every one of us shall give account of himself to God. Let us not therefore judge one another any more.*] Matth. 18. 6. [*But whosoever shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a milstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the Sea.*] Matth. 25. 34, 35, 40. [*Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom* —— *For I was hungry and ye gave me meat* —— *Verily I say unto you, in as much as you have done it unto one of the least of these my Brethren, ye have done it unto me.*] And verf. 41, 45. [*Depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire* —— *Verily I say unto you, in as much as you did it not to one of* the least *of these, you did it not to me.*]

I will recite no more: Judge now by such passages as these, how Christ sets by *one of the least* of his servants:

and consequently, how he will take it of you, to judge the far greatest part of his Church to be graceless and none of his Church, but such as shall be damned. And if you dare not venture on so unreasonable and inhumane a censure, against the experience of so much holiness as appeareth in them before your eyes, then you cannot be Papists: And if you dare venture on it, I leave you to consider, whether under pretence of being the only Christians, you have not done violence to the common reason and nature of man. So much for the second proof of the *Minor*.

3. But I have yet another proof, *that many that are no Papists are good Christians, and consequently, that Popery is a deceit*, and that is *the Testimony of many of their own Writers*. I will not call for their Testimony concerning our selves (for we know our selves better than they do) but concerning other Churches whom they condemn as Hereticks, or that are no subjects of the Pope of *Rome*. And I will at this time content my self with one of many that might be cited; and that is a Monk, *Burchardus* that lived in the Holy Land, and having wrote a Description of it, and those that inhabit it, saith of them as followeth, *p.* 325, 326. [*And for those that we judge to be damned Hereticks, as the* Nestorians, Jacobites, Maronites, Georgians, *and the like, I found them to be, for the most part, good and simple men, and living sincerely toward God and men; they are of great abstinence*, &c.

And of the Roman Catholicks he saith, *pag.* 323. [*There are in the Land of Promise men of every Nation under Heaven, and every Nation lives after their own Rites: and, to speak the very truth, to our own great confusion, there are none found in it, that are worse, and more corrupt in manners than Christians*] (he means Papists.)

And

And *page* 324. he tells us, that the Syrians, Greeks, Armenians, Georgians, Nestorians, Nubians, Jubeans, Chaldæans, Maronites, Ethiopians, Egyptians, *and many other Nations of Christians, there inhabit; and that some are schismaticks not subject to the Pope; and others called Hereticks, as the* Nestorians, Jacobites, *&c. but* (saith he) *there are many in these Sects that are very simple (or sincere), knowing nothing of heresies: devoted to Christ: macerating the flesh with fastings, and cloathed with the most simple garments; so that they far excel the very Religious of the Church of Rome.*] so you hear an Adversaries testimony.

Well then, when a Papist can prove to me, that I love not God, contrary to my own experience of my self: and when he can make me believe that no one of all the holy Heavenly Christians of my acquaintance, Ministers, or people, are in a state of charity or Justification: and that no one Christian on earth shall be saved but a Papist, then I will turn Papist: And till then they do not desire me to turn. But I must solemnly profess that this belief is so difficult to me, and abhorred by my reason, and my whole heart, and so contrary to my own knowledge, and to abundant evidence, and to all Christian charity, that I think I shall as soon be perswaded to believe that I am not a man, and that I have not the use of sence or reason, or that Snow is black, and the Crow white, as to believe this Essential point of Popery. I should a hundred times easier be brought to doubt whether I have the love of God my self, than to conclude all the Christians in the world save the Papists, to be the heirs of damnation.

CHAP. IV.

Argum. 2. *THat Doctrine is not true nor of God, which teacheth men to renounce all Christian Love and Works of Christian Love, towards most of the Christians upon earth: But so doth the Doctrine of Popery; therefore it is not of God.*

If their Error were meerly speculative, it were the less; but here we see the fruits of it, and whither it tends. The major Proposition is plainly proved from *John* 13. 35. [*By this shall all men know that ye are my Disciples, if ye have love one to another.*] Col. 1. 4. *It must be a* [*Love to all the Saints.*] 1 Thess. 4. 9. *But as touching brotherly love, ye need not that I write unto you, for ye your selves are taught of God to love one another.*]

This special Love is the Commandment of Christ, the new Commandment; without this, no man can be a Lover of God, nor be loved of him as a Member of Christ, as you may see, 1 *John* 3. 11, 12, 14, 23. & 4. 7, 8, 11, 12, 20, 21. 2 *John* 5. *John* 13. 34. & 15. 12, 17. 1 *Pet.* 1. 22. He that loveth not a Christian as a Christian, with a special love, you may see in these Texts is none of the Sons of God. And that the Papists teach men to deny this special Christian Love to most Christians in the world, I prove. They that teach men to take most true Christians in the world for no true Christians, but for Hereticks or ungodly persons that shall be damned, do teach them to deny the special love and works of love to most true Christians: But thus do the Papists; therefore, &c. How can a man love him as a Christian or a godly man, whom he must take to be no Christian, or an ungodly man? Its true they may yet

yet love them as Creatures, and so they must the Devils; and they may love them as men, and so they must the Turks and Heathens: But no man can love him as a member of Christ, whom he believes to be no member of Christ, but of the Devil. And all Papists are *bound* to this uncharitableness by their Religion, even by the Pope and general Council. And so as Christ bindeth his servants to Love one another with a special Love; so the Pope and Council bind the Papists not to love the most true Christians with a special Christian love: They cannot do it without being Hereticks themselves, or overthrowing the foundation of Popery.

And here you have a taste of the Popish Charity, when they boast above all things of their Charity. I must profess, it is their horrible inhumane uncharitableness that seems to me their most enormous crime. And also you may see here the extent of their Good works, which they so much Glory in. He that is bound not to love me as a Christian, is bound to do nothing for me as a Christian. So that they will not give a cup of cold water to a Disciple in the name of a Disciple, unless he be also a Disciple of the Pope: nor can they love or relieve Christ in his servants, when they are bound to take them as none of his servants: and so the special Love and Charity of a Papist extendeth to none but those of their own Sect: and such a Charity the Quakers, and Anabaptists, and Familists have as eminently as they. Let them take heed lest they hear, in as much as *you did it not to one of the least of these, you did it not to me.*

CHAP. V.

Argum. 3. *THat Doctrine which teacheth men to destroy or undo them whom Christ hath bound them to love as Christians, and absolveth Subjects from their Allegiance to their Princes, and requireth the deposing of them, and committing the Government of their Dominions to others, because they are judged to be Hereticks by the Pope; yea or if they will not destroy and extirpate such as he calleth Hereticks; I say this Doctrine is not of God, nor such as Christian Princes should smile upon. But such is the Doctrine of Popery: therefore,* &c.

I know that a Paper intituled *An explanation of the Roman Catholicks Belief*, and other the like, do seem to renounce the opinion of breaking faith with Hereticks, and of *promise breaking* with Magistrates (It seems they think they owe no more obedience to their Magistrates than they promise,) But as I refer the Reader to what King *James* and his defenders have said on this point (besides many more) so I shall now give you but the words of one of their own approved General Council 12. the fourth at the *Laterane* under *Innocent* 3. as *Binnius* and others of their own record it. In the first Chapter they set down their Catholick Faith, two Articles of which are, 1. *That no man can be saved out of their Universal Church.* And 2. *That the bread and wine in the Sacrament of the Altar are transubstantiate into the Body and Blood of Christ, the appearances remaining.* And in the third Chapter they say, [*We excommunicate and anathematize every heresie extolling it self against this holy orthodox Catholick faith, which we have before exponed, condemning all hereticks by what*

names

names soever they be called —— And being condemned, let them be left to the present secular Powers, or their Bailifs to be punished, the Clergy being first degraded of their Orders; and let the goods of such condemned ones be confiscate, if they be Lay-men, but if they be Clergy men let them be given to the Churches whence they had their stipends. And those that are found notable only by suspition, if they do not by congruous purgation demonstrate their innocency, according to the considerations of the suspition and the quality of the person, let them be smitten with the sword of Anathema, *and avoided by all men, till they have given sufficient satisfaction; and if they remain a year excommunicate, let them then be condemned as hereticks. And let the secular powers, in what Office soever, be admonished and perswaded, and if it be necessary, compelled by Ecclesiastical censure, that as they would be reputed and accounted Believers, so for the defence of the faith, they take an Oath publickly, that they will study in good earnest according to their power, to exterminate all that are by the Church denoted hereticks, from the Countries subject to their Jurisdiction. So that when any one shall be taken into Spiritual or Temporal power, he shall by his Oath make good this Chapter. But if the temporal Lord, being required and admonished of the Church, shall neglect to purge his Country of heretical defilement, let him by the Metropolitan and other Comprovincial Bishops be tyed by the bond of excommunication. And if he refuse to satisfie within a year, let it be signified to the Pope, that he may from thenceforth denounce his Vassals absolved from their fidelity, and may expose his Country to be seised by Catholicks, who rooting out the hereticks, may possess it without contradiction, and may keep it in the purity of faith; saving the right of the principal Lord, so be it that he himself do make no hinderance hereabout, and oppose any impedi-*

ment: and the same Law is to be observed with them that are not principal Lords. And the Catholicks that taking the sign of the Cross shall set themselves to the rooting out the Hereticks, shall enjoy the same indulgences and holy priviledges which were granted to those that go to the relief of the holy Land. Moreover we Decree, that the believers, receivers, defenders, and favourers of Hereticks, shall be excommunicate; firmly decreeing, that after any such is noted by excommunication, if he refuse to satisfie within a year: he shall from thence forth be ipso jure *infamous, and may not be admitted to publick Offices or Councils, or to the choice of such, nor to bear witness. And he shall be intestate and not have power to make a will, nor may come to a Succession of inheritance. And no man shall be forced to answer him in any cause; but he shall be forced to answer others. And if he be a Judge, his sentence shall be invalid, and no causes shall be brought to his hearing. If he be an Advocate, his Plea shall not be admitted. If a Notary (or Register) the Instruments made by him shall be utterly void, and damned with the damned Author. And so in other the like cases, we command that it be observed.*] Thus they go on further commanding Bishops by themselves, or their Arch-deacons, or other fit persons, once or twice a year to search every Parish where any Heretick is found to dwell, and put all the Neighbourhood to their Oaths, whether they know of any Hereticks there, or any private meetings, or any that in life and manners do differ from the common conversation of the faithful, *&c.* And the Bishops that neglect these things are to be cast out, and others put into their places that will do them.

And Pope *Gregory* 7. *l.* 4. *Epist.* 7. expresly stirs up the people to cast off their Princes, saying [*And for the conspiracy of Hereticks and the King, we believe it is not*

not unknown to you that are near them, how it may be impugned by the Catholick Bishops and Dukes, and many others in the German parts: for the faithful of the Church of Rome *are come to such a number, that unless the King shall come to satisfaction, they may openly profess to choose another King, and observing Justice, we have promised to favour them, and will keep our promise firm,* &c.]

The sum of all is, that all that the Pope calls Hereticks, must be condemned and destroyed, and all Kings, Princes or Lords, that will not execute his sentence and root them out, must be dispossessed of their Dominions, and the subjects absolved from their fidelity (whatever Oaths they had taken) and all others that do but favour or receive them be utterly undone.

I fetch not these things out of the writings of the Protestants, nor from any private Doctors of their own, but from the very words of a General Council confirmed by the Pope, and unquestionably approved by them. And abundance the like might be produced. And many ages saw this doctrine put in execution, when the Emperors of *Germany* were deposed by the Pope, and the Subjects absolved from their Allegiance, as the many volumes written in those times, and published together by *Goldastus*, testifie. And the King of *France*, or any other that tolerate any of the supposed Hereticks, may see what a censure they are exposed to, if meer necessity were not their security.

Perhaps some will say, that *this Decree was not* de fide, *but a temporary precept.* *Answ.* When a precept requireth duty, it may be a point of Faith to believe it. Precepts are the Objects of Faith, at least as they are assertions, that the thing commanded is our duty. It is an Article of Faith, that God is to be loved and obeyed, and our Superiors to be

be honoured, and our Neighbour to be loved, and Charity to be exercised, *&c.* The Creation, the Incarnation of Christ, his death, resurrection, ascension, glorification, intercession, his future Judgement, the Resurrection of the body, *&c.* are all matters of fact, and yet matters of faith too. If practicals be not Articles of faith, then we have no Articles of faith at all: for all our Theology and Religion is practical. Do Papists murder poor Christians by thousands, and yet not *fide divina* believe that it is their duty so to do? Either it is a duty, or a sin, or indifferent. If *a sin*, woe to their Pope and Council (and if this be no sin with them, I know not why the world should be troubled by them with the name of sin.) If it be *indifferent*, what then shall be called sin? If they can swallow such Camels, as the blood of many thousand Christians, what need they strain at Gnats, and stick at private Murders, or Fornication, or Lying, or Slandering, any more than the Jesuit-Casuists do, that are cited by the *Jansenian* in his Mystery of Jesuitism? But if these Murders and deposing Kings be indeed a duty, how can they know it to be so, but by Believing? And indeed if a General Council and the Pope are to be believed, who give it us with a *Decernimus & firmiter statuimus*, then it is doubtless a point of faith: and if they are not to be believed, then Popery is all but a meer deceit.

Object. 2. *But may we not be Roman Catholicks though we joyn not with them in this point? Have not many such renounced it? and so may we.* *Answ.* If you renounce the Decrees of a Pope and General Council, you renounce your Religion in the very foundation of it, and cannot be Papists, if you know what you do; but are in the Roman account as errant Hereticks as those that they have tortured and burnt to ashes: though here in *England* where they cannot handle you as they would do, they dare not tell

tell you so. And if you may renounce the Decrees of a Pope and General Council, when they say, [*It is a duty, or lawful to exterminate all as Heretick, that believe not Transubstantiation, and to seize upon the Lands of Princes that will not do it, and to deliver them to others that will, and absolve their Vassals from their fidelity*] I say, if you may renounce them in this, why may not we have as free leave to renounce them in other things as groundless?

CHAP. VI.

Argum. 4. *THE true Catholick Church is Holy: the Church of* Rome *hath for many generations been unholy: therefore the Church of* Rome *was not in any of those Generations the true Catholick Church.*

The Major Proposition is an Article of the Creed professed by themselves, as much as by us, [*I Believe the Holy Catholick Church.*]

The unholiness of the Church of *Rome*, I prove undeniably, thus: *If an Essential part of the Church of* Rome, *even its Head, hath been unholy through many Generations, then the Church of* Rome *hath been unholy, for many Generations: but an Essential part, even the Head, hath been unholy: therefore,* &c.

The Consequence of the Major is past denial. *Bonum est ex causis integris.* Though it will not follow that the Church is Holy, because one Essential part is Holy, yet it clearly followeth that the Church is unholy, because an Essential part is unholy. As it followeth not that the Body is sound, because the Head is sound; yet it followeth, that the man (or the body) is unsound or sick, because the Head is unsound or sick. As it is not a Church without all its Essential parts, so it is not an *Holy Church* without the *Holiness* of all its *Essential* parts.

And

And that they make the Pope the Head of the Catholick Church, and an Essential part, I am loth to prove; I would I could but entice them to deny it: for it is the principal controversie between them and the true Catholicks.

And that abundance of their Popes have been unholy, I have formerly proved, and they dare not I hope deny it; when their own Historians describe their Impieties, and their own Writers, even those that are bittereſt againſt us, do freely confeſs it: yea General Councils have judged them and caſt them out. The number of theſe Monſters is ſo great, that it would make a volume greater than I intend, but to name them and recite their crimes. I will give a brief inſtance of one of them.

Pope *John* the twenty third was accuſed and depoſed by the General Council at *Conſtance*, upon about ſeventy Articles which in *Binnius* take up about thirteen columes *in folio*: and therefore I ſuppoſe you would give me no thanks to trouble you with the recital of them all. The firſt Article was, that he was from his youth, a man of a bad diſpoſition, immodeſt, impudent, a lyar, a rebel and diſobedient to his parents, and given to moſt vices; and then was, and yet is, commonly taken for ſuch a one by all that knew him. The ſecond Article was, how by Simoniacal and unjuſt means he grew rich. The third Article, that by *Simony* he was promoted to be a Cardinal. The fourth Article, that being Legat at *Bononia* he governed Tyrannically, impiouſly, unjuſtly, being wholly aliene from all Chriſtian piety, and juſtice, divine and humane, *&c.* The fifth Article, that thus he got to be Pope, and yet continued as bad, and as a Pagan deſpiſed the worſhip of God, and if he performed any, it was more leſt he ſhould be totally blamed of hereſie and caſt out of the Papacy, than for

for any devotion, and he hudled it up like an Hunter or a Souldier. The sixth Article was, that he was the oppressor of the poor, the persecutor of righteousness, the pillar of the unjust and the Simoniacal, a server of the flesh, the dregs of vices, a stranger to vertue, flying from publick consistories, wholly given to sleep and carnal desires, wholly contrary to the life and manners of Christ, the mirror of infamy, and the profound inventor of all mischiefs; so far scandalizing the Church of Christ, that among Christian Believers that knew his life and manners, he is commonly called, *The Devil incarnate.* The seventh Article was, that being a vessel of all sins, repelling the worthy, he Simoniacally sold Benefices, Bishopricks and Church-dignities openly to the unworthy that would give most for them.

Reader, I should but weary thee to add threescore more of these Articles. These were all proved to be Notorious by Cardinals, Arch-bishops, Bishops, and many more. Yet I will crave thy patience while I add but two or three of the last. Another was, that he came to be Pope by causing Pope *Alexander* and his Physitian Dr. *Daniel de Sophia* to be poysoned. Another was, that he committed incest with his brothers Wife, and with the holy Nuns, and Whoredom with Virgins, and adultery with mens Wives, and other crimes of incontinency, for which the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience. Another, that he was a wicked man, notoriously guilty of Murder, Witchcraft and other grievous crimes, a dissipater of the Church goods, a notorious Simonist, and pertinacious Heretick. The next Article was, that often and often before divers Prelats and other honest men, by the Devils perswasion, he obstinately asserted, dogmatized, and maintained, that there is no life everlasting, nor

nor any other after this; Moreover, he said and obstinately believed that the soul of man doth die and is extinct with the body like the bruit beasts, and that the dead shall not rise again at the last day, contrary to the Article of the Resurrection. The last and some other Articles are about his perfidiousnes.] And hereupon the Council deposed him.

And now Reader I leave thee to judge, whether the *Roman* Church had a holy Head, when it had a *Heathen* and a *Devil incarnate?*

So the general Council at *Basil* deposed Pope *Eugenius* 4. as being [*A rebel against the holy Canons, a notorious disturber and scandalizer of the peace and unity of the Church, a Simonist and a perjured wretch, incorrigible, a schismatick, and an obstinate Heretick.*]

Pope *John* 13. *alias* 12. was in Council convicted of *ravishing Maids, Wives, Widows at the Apostolick doors, and committing many murders: he drunk a health to the Devil, and at Dice called to* Jupiter *and* Venus *for help, and at last was slain in the act of Adultery.* Saith *Platina* [*he was from his youth a man contaminated with all dishonesty and filthiness, and if he had any time to spare from his lusts, he spent it in hunting, and not in praying.*] And after he calls him [*a most wicked man, or rather a Monster*] and saith that [*the life of this most wicked man being judged in a Council of* Italian *Bishops, for fear of them he fled and lived like a wild beast in the woods,*] till at last he got the better again by the help of his friends at *Rome*; till an angry man that found him naught with his wife, got the better of him, and sent him to answer it in another world. And their own writers note that this was the first Pope that changed his name, whom his followers imitated. And do you think the Head of the *Roman* Church was then Holy?

If

If it were a disputable matter, I would prove out of abundance of their own writers, that many others of them have been most wicked wretches, common adulterers, and fornicators, yea Sodomites, poysoning their predecessors to get the Popedom, *&c.* But it's needless, because they deny it not. *Baronius* their flattering Champion saith (*Annal. ad an.* 912.) [*What then was the face of the holy Roman Church? How exceeding filthy, when the most potent, and yet the most sordid whores did rule at* Rome? *by whose Pleasure Sees were changed, Bishops were given, and which is a thing horrid to be heard, and not to be spoken, their Lovers (or mates) were thrust into* Peters *Chair, being false Popes, who are not to be written in the Catalogue of the Roman Popes, but only for the marking out of such times. And what kind of Cardinals, Priests, and Deacons think you we must imagine that these monsters did choose, when nothing is so rooted in nature as for every one to beget his like?*

And *Genebrard* that spleenish Papist (*li.* 4. *Sec.* 10.) saith [*In this one thing that age was unhappy, that for near one hundred and fifty years about fifty Popes did wholly fall away from the virtue of their ancestors, being rather irregular and Apostatical, than Apostolical*] So that the Church of *Rome* had not then either a Holy or Apostolical Head.

And Pope *Adrian* the sixth himself writeth (*De Sacram. Confir. Art.* 4.) that *there have many Popes of* Rome *been Hereticks.* And two or three several General Councils did condemn Pope *Honorius* for an Heretick.

And if I should tell you but what their own writers say of the wickedness of the Roman Clergy, in many ages; and of the wickedness of the Roman people; of the large summs of money that the Pope hath yearly for the licensed or tolerated Whore-houses in *Rome*,

you

you would think that the body of the particular Roman Church were near kin to the Head, and therefore not the Holy Mistris of all Churches.

But perhaps some will say, that the *Pope was holy because his Office was Holy, though his person vicious.* *Answ.* 1. If this be the *Holiness* of the Catholick Church, mentioned in the Creed, then the Institution of offices is it that makes it Holy, and while the office continueth, the Holiness cannot be lost. 2. Then let them prove their Holiness by Saints no more. 3. Let them not then delude the people, but speak out, and tell them that they mean such Holiness as is consistent with Heathenism, or Infidelity, Murders, Sodomie, and may be in an incarnate Devil! Is this the Holiness of the Catholick Church?

Object. *But you may have unholy persons among you also, that yet say you are of the true Church.*

Answ. But they are no *Essential* part of the Catholick Church which we believe; and therefore it may be a Holy Church, though they be unholy. But the Pope is an *Essential* part of the *Roman* Church which they believe in; and therefore it cannot be Holy, if he be unholy.

Object. *By this means you leave no room for the Church of* Rome, *or any Papist, in the Catholick Church which is truly Holy.*

Answ. Not as Papists: so they can be no members of it. But if with any of them Christianity be predominant, and prevail against the infection of Popery, so that it practically extinguish not Christianity, then as Christians they may be members of the Church, and be saved too, but not as Papists.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

Argum. 5. *THE true Catholick Church of Christ is but One: The pretended Roman Catholick Church is more than One: Therefore the pretended Roman Catholick Church is not the true Catholick Church of Christ.*

The Major is confeſſed. The Minor I prove thus, 1. *Where there are two Heads or Soveraign Powers ſpecifically diſtinct, there are two Societies, or Churches. But thoſe called Papiſts, or the Roman Catholick Church, have two Heads or Soveraign Powers ſpecifically diſtinct. Therefore they are two Churches.*

The Major is granted by all Politicians, who do without contradiction ſpecifie Common-wealths and other Political Societies from the Soveraign Powers: and ſo the Monarchical, Ariſtocratical and Democratical are ſeveral *Species*. The *Belgian* Common-wealth and the *French*, be not ſpecifically the ſame.

The Minor hath two ſtanding proofs ſo viſible that he muſt be blind indeed that cannot ſee them. Firſt there are the many Volumes that are written by both ſides for their ſeveral forms: *Bellarmine*, *Gretſer* and the reſt of the *Italian* faction proving that the Pope is the chief Power, and above a General Council, and the ſeat of Infallibility, and not to be judged by any, being himſelf the Judge of the whole world. And the other party proving that a General Council is above the Pope, and that he is to be judged by them, and may be depoſed by them. If any ſay, that they are but few and no true Catholicks of this Opinion, I anſwer, Then a General Council are but few and no true Catholicks, which yet is ſaid by them to repreſent the whole Catholick Church:

For the General Council of *Constance* and of *Basil* have peremptorily asserted it, and repeat it over and over; yea the Council of *Basil* say, *Sess. ultim.* that [*Not one of the skilful did ever doubt but that the Pope was subject to the Judgement of a General Council, in things that concern faith. And that he cannot without their consent dissolve or remove a General Council; yea and that this is an Article of faith, which without destruction of salvation cannot be denyed, and that the Council is above the Pope,* de fide, *and that it cannot be removed without their own consent, and that he is an heretick that is against these things*] See *Binnius p.* 4. 79. 96. And Pope *Eugenius* owned this Council *ibid. pag.* 42. And for the Council of *Constance*, *Martin* the fifth was chosen by it, and present in it, and personally confirmed it in these words [*Quod omnia & singula determinata, conclusa, & decreta, in materiis fidei per praesens concilium, conciliariter tenere & inviolabiliter observare volebat, & nunquam contraire quoquo modo. Ipsaq; sic conciliariter facta approbat & ratificat, & non aliter, nec alio modo*] (that is, what they did as a Council, and not what private members did): You see then even General Councils representing the Catholick Church do not only say that a Council is above the Pope, but make it an Article of faith, and damn those that deny it. (What then is become of *Bellarmine* and the rest of their champions?)

But perhaps you'l say, *they are but few on the other side.* I answer: yes: Not only most Popes, and the *Italian* Clergy, and the predominant party of Papists, but another General Council, even that at the *Lateran*, under *Julius* 2. and *Leo* 10. expresly determine on the contrary, that the *Pope is above a General Council.* So that here is not only an undenyable proof that General Councils are fallible by their contradicting each other,

other, and that there is a Neceſſity of rejecting ſome of them, and conſequently that the Foundation of Popery is rotten; but alſo here is one Repreſentative Catholick Church againſt another Repreſentative Catholick Church, and one Council for one *Species* of Soveraignty, and another for another *Species* of Soveraignty: So that undoubtedly it is not the ſame Church, that had two heads of ſeveral ſorts.

2. And the Nations that are on both ſides to this day, are a proof beyond denyal of their diviſion. The *French* on one ſide, and the *Italians* on the other; and other nations divided between both. So that the thing which they call by one name, is two indeed. But ſo is not the true Catholick Church.

Obj. *What though ſome in* England *took the King to be the Soveraign, and ſome the Parliament, and ſome thought it was in both Conjunct; did this prove that you were more than one Common-wealth?*

Anſw. Two diſtinct Soveraigns, cannot be in one Kingdom: But where the Soveraignty is mixt and not in one alone, if any one ſhall ſet up the one as the only Soveraign, and ſubject the other to them, they change the form of the Commonwealth, but do not ſet up two Commonwealths; but if half take one for the Soveraign, and the other half take the other for the Soveraign, they plainly divide the Commonwealth into two: if they do it only in mind, and the ſecret thoughts of their hearts, this cannot be known to others, and ſo cannot be the ground of a Society: but if they do it by a publick conſent and practice, they evidently make two Commonwealths. It is not poſſible that one Political body ſhould have two Soveraigns ſpecifically diſtinct. Indeed it may have five hundred natural perſons in the Soveraignty (as in a Senate;) but they are but one Political perſon, or one *ſumma poteſtas*.

2. But I prove the Minor by another Argument. *Where there are two three or four Heads or Soveraigns at once numerically distinct, there are two or three or four Churches. But the* Roman *Church pretending to be Catholick, hath had two or three or four Heads at once numerically distinct; therefore it was two or three or four Churches.*

The Major is a known truth to all that are verst in any degree in the doctrine of Politicks. It is not only two *species* of Soveraignty, but two *individual* Soveraigns that are inconsistent with the numerical Unity of a Political body. Two, or ten, or two hundred may joyn in one Soveraignty, as one Political person (as I said); but if there be two Soveraigns, there are certainly two Societies: for if both be supream, neither is Subordinate. The Minor is not to be denyed: for the Papists lay their very foundation on a supposed division: forsooth *Peter* and *Paul* were both at once their Bishops. And there is not many of them that adventure to tell us, that *Peter* only was the Supream, and that *Paul* was under him: but they make them as equals, or coordinate; and some of them say, that *Paul* was the Bishop of the uncircumcision, and *Peter* of the Circumcision (and then *Peters* Church is confined to the Jews). And they do not tell us, that one Headship was divided between them: For then that example would direct them still to have two Popes, or two Bishops to a Church: so that *Peter* being a Head, and *Paul* a Head, they had sure distinct bodies.

But whether they stand to this or not, they cannot deny their many following divisions. The twenty third schism (as *Wernerus* a zealous Papist *in fasciculo tempor.* reckons them) was between *Felix* the fifth and *Eugenius*: of which the said *Wernerus* speaking saith, [*That hence arose great contention among the writers of this matter,*

matter, pro & contra, *and they cannot agree to this day: for one part ſaith, that a Council is above the Pope, the other part on the contrary ſaith, No, but the Pope is above the Council. God grant his Church peace*, &c.]

Of the twenty ſecond ſchiſm the ſame *Wernerus* ſaith thus, (*ad annum* 1373.) [*the twenty ſecond ſchiſm was the worſt and moſt ſubtil ſchiſm of all that were before it. For it was ſo perplexed, that the moſt Learned and Conſcientious men were not able to diſcuß (or find out) to whom they ſhould adhere. And it was continued for fourty years, to the great ſcandal of the whole Clergy, and the great loß of ſouls, becauſe of Hereſies and other evils that then ſprung up, becauſe there was then no diſcipline in the Church againſt them. And therefore from this* Urbane *the ſixth to the time of* Martin *the fifth, I know not who was Pope.*]

After *Nicolas the fourth there was no Pope for two years and an half, and* Celeſtine *the fifth that ſucceeded him reſigning it*, Boniface *the eighth entered, that ſtiled himſelf* Lord of the whole world in Spirituals and Temporals, *of whom it was ſaid*, He entered as a Fox, lived as a Lyon, and dyed like a Dog, *ſaith the ſame* Wernerus.

The *twentieth ſchiſm* (ſaith the ſame Author) *was great between* Alexander *the third, and four Schiſmaticks, and it laſted ſeventeen years.*

The nineteenth ſchiſm was between Innocent *the ſecond, and* Peter Leonis: *and* Innocent *got the better, becauſe he had more on his ſide* (*ſaith he.*)

The thirteenth ſchiſm (*ſaith* Wernerus) *was between another and* Benedict *the eighth.*

The fourteenth ſchiſm (*ſaith the ſame Author*) *was ſcandalous and full of confuſion between* Benedict *the ninth and five others, which* Benedict (*ſaith he*) *was wholly vitious, and therefore being damned, appeared*

in a monstrous and horrid shape; his head and tail were like an Asses, and the rest of his body like a Bear, saying, I thus appear, because I lived like a beast.] *In this schism (saith* Wernerus*) there were no less than six Popes at once.* 1. Benedict *was expulsed.* 2. Silvester *the third gets in, but is cast out again, and* Benedict *restored.* 3. *But being again cast out,* Gregory *the sixth is put into his place; who because he was ignorant of letters (*and yet infallible no doubt*) caused another Pope to be Consecrated with him to perform Church Offices; which was the fourth; which displeased many, and therefore a third is chosen,* (which was the fifth) *instead of the two that were fighting with one another: but* Henry *(the Emperor) coming in, deposed them all, and chose* Clement *the second,* (who was the sixth of all them that were alive at once).

But above all schisms that between *Formosus* and *Sergius*, and their followers, was the foulest; such saying and unsaying, doing and undoing there was besides the dismembring of the dead Pope, and casting him into the water. And of eight Successors, saith *Wernerus*, [*I can say nothing observable of them; because I find nothing of them but scandalous, because of the unheard of contention in the holy Apostolick See, one against another, and together mutually against each other.*]

Reader, wouldst thou be troubled with any more of these Relations? I tell thee nothing but from their own Historians, and that which multitudes of them agree in: I go not to a Protestant for a word. But one Pope in those contentious times, I find lived in some peace, and that was *Silvester* the second, of whom saith *Wernerus* (as others commonly) [*This* Silvester *was made Pope by the help of the Devil to whom he did homage: that all might go as he would have it:* —— *but he quickly met with the*

usual

usual End, as one that had placed his Hope in deceitful Devils.]

Well! I shall now appeal to reason it self, whether this were one Church, that for fourty (or say others fifty) years together had several Heads, some of the people following one, and some another, and the most Learned and most Conscientious not able to know the right Pope, nor know him not to this day. If *England* were fourty years thus divided between two Kings, it were certainly two Kingdoms. But the true Catholick Church of Christ is but one.

CHAP. VIII.

Argum. 6. *THE true Catholick Church hath never ceased or discontinued, since the founding of it to this day. The Church of* Rome *hath ceased or discontinued: therefore the Church of* Rome *is not the true Catholick Church.*

I prove the Minor (for the Major they will grant.) *If the Head which is an Essential part hath discontinued, then the Church of* Rome *hath discontinued. But the Head hath discontinued: therefore,* &c.

The Minor only needs proof: and that I prove 1. *There have been many years interregrum or vacancy, when there was no Pope at all.* And where then was the Church when it had no Head?

2. There have been long successions of such as you confess your selves, were not Apostolical, but Apostatical.

3. Your own Popes and Councils command us to take such for no Popes. For example, Pope *Nicolas* in his Decretals (see *Caranza pag.* 393.) saith [*He that by money or the favour of men, or popular or military tumults is intruded into the Apostolical seat*

without the Concordant and Canonical election of the Cardinals and the following religious Clergy, let him not be taken for a Pope, nor Apostolical, but for Apostatical.] And even of Priests, he commandeth, [*Let no man hear Mass of a Priest whom he certainly knoweth to have a Concubine or woman introduced*] Caranza, *page* 395. and *ibid.* he saith, [*Priests that commit fornication, cannot have the honour of Priesthood.*]

4. But our greater Argument is from the authority of God, and the very nature of the office. *An Infidel, or notoriously ungodly man, is not capable of being a Pastor of the Church,* (in sensu composito, *while he is such*). *But the Popes of* Rome *have been Infidels, and notoriously ungodly men: therefore they were uncapable of being Pastors of the Church* (and consequently that Church was Headless, and so no Church.) The Major I prove. 1. Where there is not the necessary matter and disposition of the matter, there can be no reception of the form. But Infidels and notoriously ungodly men, are not matter sufficiently disposed to receive the form of Pastoral Power: therefore they cannot receive it.

The Minor is proved. 1. As every true Church is a Christian Church (it being only a Congregation of Christians that we so call, in our present case) so every Pastor is a Christian Pastor: but an Infidel or notoriously ungodly man is not a Christian Pastor: therefore not a true Pastor. 2. Otherwise a Mahometan, Jew, or Heathen may be a true Pope; which I think they will deny themselves. 3. If any Disposition or Qualification at all be necessary to the being of the Pastoral Office (besides manhood) then is it necessary, that he own God the Father, and the Redeemer (that is, be not notoriously an Infidel, or ungodly.) But some qualification is necessary: therefore, *&c.* None can be named more necessary than this.

And

And that Popes have been such as I here mention, is proved before. Not to mention *Marcellinus* that sacrificed to an Idol, or *Liberius* that subscribed to the Arrian profession; (for I believe there is an hundred times more hope of their Salvation by Repentance, than of an hundred of their Successors) *John* the twenty second held that the soul dies with the body, of which the Parisians and others condemned him. *John* the twenty third, as I shewed before, denyed the life to come, and so was an Infidel. The Witchcraft, Poysonings, Simony, Sodomy, Adulteries, Incest, *&c.* of others, are sufficiently recorded by their own Historians.

CHAP. IX.

Argum. 7. TO the foregoing Arguments, I add the recital of one formerly mentioned, for the use of all that have the use of their wits and senses.

If a man may be sure, that he knows bread to be bread, and wine to be wine, when he seeth, feeleth, and tasteth them, then he may be sure that Popery is a deceit. (This Consequence they cannot question) *But a man may be sure that he knoweth bread to be bread, and wine to be wine, when he seeth, feeleth, and tasteth them: therefore*, &c.

Note that I speak of such a knowledge as belongs to men of sound wits and senses, and a convenient object and *medium*. It is the senses of the whole world that I appeal to, and not of one or two: it is bread and wine that are near us, in the hand or mouth that I speak of, and not at a miles distance: in the day-light, and not in the dark. So that take the bread and wine into your

your hand, and judge of it, and let this decide our Controverſie. If you can tell whether that be bread or no bread, you may tell whether the Papiſts or we are in the right. Thoſe therefore that be not learned and ſubtil enough to judge by Diſputations and writings of Learned men, may yet judge by their ſight and feeling. Either you know bread and wine when you ſee it, taſte it, feel it, or you do not. If you do, then the Controverſie is at an end: for the ſenſes of all ſound men in the world, will be againſt the Papiſts, that ſay the bread after Conſecration is no bread, and the wine is no wine. But if you cannot know bread when you ſee, feel, and eat it, then ſee what follows. 1. Then we are ſure that the Pope and all his Council are not at all to be truſted: for if ſence be not to be truſted, then the Pope and his Council know not when they read the Scripture, and Canons, and Fathers, and hear Traditions, but that they are deceived. 2. Then we are uncertain of any Judgement that Pope or Council can give: for when they ſpoke or wrote it, we are uncertain whether our eyes and ears, or reaſon judging by them, are not deceived in the hearing or reading of their words. 3. How ridiculouſly then do they call for a Judge of Controverſies? and what a fooliſh quarrel is it that they make, who ſhall be the Interpreter of Scriptures, or Judge of Controverſies? For what can a Judge do but ſpeak or write his mind? and when he hath done, you know not what it is that you hear or read, becauſe your ſenſes may deceive you. Its a far harder matter to underſtand a ſentence or book of the Pope or Council when you read or hear it, than to know bread when you ſee, and feel, and eat it. Many thouſands know bread, that know not the Popes ſentence, nor a word of a book. 4. And by this rule, it is uncertain whether Scripture be true, or Chriſtianity the true Religion.

For

For we cannot know it but by our ſenſes: and if they are ſo uncertain, all our Religion muſt needs be uncertain. 5. Yea we cannot tell what Revelation to deſire that ſhould end our Controverſies and make us certain. For if God ſhould ſend an Angel or other Meſſenger from Heaven to decide the Controverſies between us and the Papiſts, what could he do more but ſpeak it to us as from God? and we ſhould ſtill be uncertain of what we ſee or hear: ſo that we are left uncurably in our ignorance and Controverſies, if Popery be true.

And here you may ſee upon what terms we diſpute with Papiſts, and what hope there is of ſatisfying them. We diſpute with men that will not believe their own ſenſes, or the ſenſes of the world. The damned man, *Luke* 16. thought if one might have been ſent to his brethren from the dead, they would have believed. And if *Abraham* ſay to them, If they will not hear *Moſes* and the Prophets, neither will they be perſwaded though one riſe from the dead; we may ſay of Papiſts, ſure, if they will not believe their own eyes, and ears, and taſte, and know not bread when they ſee, and feel, and eat it, how ſhould they be perſwaded, though one were ſent to them from Heaven to reſolve them? Can we think by all our *Arguments* to make any matter plainer to a man than that *Bread is Bread*, when he ſeeth and eateth it? If this be uncertain to them, what can you prove to them, or what way can you deviſe to deal with them? For indeed, if *ſenſe* be uncertain, we have no certainty of any thing in the world.

But to this *H. T.* (they ſay *H. Turbervile*) in his Manual of Controverſies ſaith thus. [Anſw. *Subſtance is not the proper and immediate object of ſenſe, but colour, quantity,* &c. *Nor can ſenſe judge at all of ſubſtance though it be under ſenſible accidents, unleß it be the ſubject of thoſe accidents, and have a ſenſible and corporal manner*

manner of being, which the Body of Christ neither is, nor hath in that Sacrament. It hath a spiritual manner of being, and is not the subject of the accidents of bread; they are without a subject by Miracle; therefore no wonder, if sense be deceived in this matter. Here Sense and Reason must vail bonnet to faith, and submit to the Authority of God revealing, and the Church propounding; they are no competent Judges what God can do by his Omnipotence.] Thus *H. T.*

Repl. And is this all that these Rabbies have to satisfie the world that it is not Bread and Wine which is seen, and felt, and tasted! Let us first take notice of the by-passages of his answer, and then reply to the substance. 1. Is not this like the rest of their contradictory imaginations? That Christ hath not a Corporal manner of Being in the Sacrament: and yet it is not Bread, but his Body that is there: yea before *page* 207. he saith, [We maintain not his Corporal, but real and spiritual presence in the Sacrament.] So that either they affirm that his *Body is present*, and yet deny his *Bodily presence*; or else they affirm his *Bodily* presence, but not his *Corporal* presence. Most learnedly! We shall at last be taught to distinguish between *Bodily and Corporal!* But is not the Juggle in the word [*Manner?*] Perhaps the Corporal presence is not denyed, but the Corporal manner. *Answ.* 1. Yes, in terms its said [*We maintain not his Corporal presence*] 2. And can a Body be present, and not in a Bodily manner? And why is [*Spiritually*] put as contradistinct? Sure when *Paul* said our Bodies shall be raised *spiritual bodies*, he thought that they were nevertheless *bodies* for being *spiritual*; and therefore it is nevertheless a *Bodily* manner of presence, for being a *spiritual manner*. But if by the Corporal presence or manner (denyed) be meant nothing but the qualities and quantity by which

which it is fit to be the Object of our ſenſes, why had we not this plainly without jugling? To ſay *Chriſt is preſent in Body but not ſenſibly*, is plainer Engliſh, than to ſay *that he is preſent in Body but not Bodily preſent.*

2. Note alſo that he calls them [*The accidents of bread*] and yet ſaith [*they are without a ſubject*]. And ſo doth *the Explanation of the Roman Catholick Belief*, and their ordinary writers ſay that the Body of Chriſt is under the *forms of Bread and Wine*, and yet ſay that *Bread and Wine are none of the ſubject of thoſe forms.*

3. Note alſo that he profeſſeth *Tranſubſtantiation is a Miracle*, and ſo every ignorant, drunken, adulterous Prieſt of theirs hath the gift of Miracles, which he worketh as oft as he conſecrateth: No wonder if Miracles be the glory of their Church, and the proof of their Infallibility; But let us come to the ſubſtance of his Anſwer.

1. He tells you that *ſubſtance is not the proper and immediate object of ſenſe, but colour, quantity, &c.* But 1. Is not the *Mediate Object* [*Proper*] as well as the *Immediate?* 2. But what gather you hence? be it *a Proper or improper* Object, I hope we may yet have leave to believe that Reaſon by the help of ſenſe doth judge as infallibly of *Subſtances* as *Accidents.* If you think otherwiſe, then all the forementioned conſequences are undenyable. You know not whether the world ſaw Chriſt on earth: or whether he were crucified, dead, buried, roſe, or aſcended: It might be but *colour and quantity* which men ſaw; and when Chriſt told them a ſpirit hath nor fleſh and blood as ye ſee me have, they might have anſwered, *We ſee no fleſh and blood, but colour and quantity:* And *Thomas* had then ſmall reaſon to be convinced by *ſeeing and feeling*, when he

he saw but *colour and quantity*, and felt but *quantity and quality*. By this reasoning the world is not sure that ever there was a *Pope of* Rome, but the *Colour of a Pope*, or other accidents. And you know not that there is any earth under your feet, or that you are a man, or have a body, because your senses perceive but the accidents of it.

2. But what manner of men did *H. T.* imagine he had to deal with, when he puts off his Readers with such an answer as this? Mark Reader the unfaithful dealing of these men, and how grosly they abuse poor people that follow them with meer deceits. The Question or Objection which he undertook to answer was, *Whether sense telling us that it is Bread after the Consecration be deceived?* To this he takes on him to give an answer, and cunningly speaks to another question, and passeth this by. Its one question, *Whether sense can infallibly discern Christ in the Sacrament, if he were there, or discern that he is not there?* and another question *Whether sense can infallibly discern Bread and Wine, and know whether they be there?* The last was the question in hand: but he slily answers to the first instead of it; and tells us, *that sense cannot judge of substance, though under sensible accidents, unless it be the subject of those accidents, and have a sensible and corporal manner of being, which the body of Christ neither is nor hath in the Sacrament.*] And so goes on. And what of all this? [*Therefore Christ may be in the Sacrament and you not discern him by sense.*] Well: and whats that to the question? O Sir, is it not the holy truth of God that you are about? and should you thus abuse it, and the souls of men? you knew the question is, *Whether sense* (and the intellect thereby) *be infallible in judging Bread to be Bread when we see, feel and eat it?* Had you never a word to say to this? to perswade men that they have eyes and see

not,

not, and hands and feel not, or that the world knoweth not certainly what they seem to know by seeing and feeling? I pray you hereafter deal by us as fairly as *Bellarmine* did (and yet we will thank you for nothing) who quite gave away the *Roman* cause by granting and pleading [*that sense is infallible in Positives: and therefore we may thence say, This is a Body Because I see it*; (*and so this is Bread or Wine because I see, feel and taste it*) *but not in Negatives: and therefore we cannot say, This is not a Body because I see it not.*] I pray you give over talking of the *Pope*, or *Church*, or *Religion*, or *Men*, if you are uncertain of substances which are (suppose but *per accidentia*) the Objects of your sense. And take nothing ill that I write of you, till you are more certain that you see it, and know what you see.

3. But you'l say [*Sense and Reason must here vail bonnet to faith.*] *Answ.* In the *Negative* case let it be granted, and any case where faith can be faith. But if sense (and the Intellect therewith) be fallible in *Positives*, so that we cannot know Bread when we see and eat it, *faith cannot be faith then.* What talk you of faith, if you credit not the soundest senses of all the men in the world, when *sense and reason are presupposed to faith.* How know you that faith here contradicteth sense? You'l say, because the Church or Scripture saith: *This is my Body*: and that *there is no Bread?* But how know you that there is any such thing in Scripture? or that the Church so holdeth? You think you have read or heard it: But how know you that your sense deceived you not? He that cannot know *Bread* when he seeth and eateth it, is unlikely to know *letters* and their *meaning* when he seeth them.

See more of my answer to such Objections in a Book entitled *The Safe Religion*, *p.* 241. *to* 248.

The

The ſimpleſt Reader that hath honeſty and charity, is ſecured againſt Popery by the firſt Argument, which he may make good to his own ſoul againſt all the Jeſuites on earth. And he that is unable to proceed on that account, may by the evidence of this laſt Argument confute any Papiſt living, if he be a man of ſenſe and reaſon. And having brought all our controverſie ſo low, that ſenſe it ſelf may be the judge, I ſhall go no further in Argument, as thinking it vain to uſe any reaſon with that man that will not believe his own eye-ſight, nor the ſight, and feeling, and taſte of all the world beſides.

CHAP. X.

I Come now to the next and principal part of my task, which is to open to you their Deceits, and give you Directions for the diſcovery and confutation of them, that by the help of theſe you may ſee the Truth.

Detect. 1. Remember this ground which they have given you, that *If you prove them guilty but of any one Error in points of belief determined by their Church, you thereby diſprove the whole body of Popery, as ſuch.* For you pull up the foundation which they build on, and the Authority into which they reſolve their faith. They will grant you, that if they are deceived by the Church in one thing, they have no certainty of any thing upon the Churches credit. So that if you read *Pauls* diſcourſe againſt Praying in an unknown tongue, or the many precepts for our reading and meditating in the Law of God, or the like, and can but perceive that the Popiſh Latine ſervice, or their forbidding men to read the Scripture, *&c.* are contrary hereto, or

or if you find out but any one of their Errors, you cannot be a Papist, if you understand their Profession.

But it is not so with us: for though we know that the Scripture and all that is in it is of infallible Truth, and that every true Christian (while such) is infallible in the Essentials of Christianity; (for else he were no Christian) yet we profess that we know but in part, and that our own Writings and Confessions may possibly in some things be besides the sense of Scripture; and there being much more propounded in Scripture to our faith, than what is of absolute necessity to salvation, we may possibly after our studying and praying mistake in some things that are not of the Essence, but the Integrity of Christianity, and are necessary to the *Melius esse*, the strength, or comfort, though not to the being of a Christian. So that every Error in *their* faith, destroyes their grounds, and so their new Religion; but so doth not every Error of ours.

Or to speak more distinctly; let us distinguish between the *Fides quæ & qua*; their *Objective faith*, and our *Subjective faith*. 1. Their *Objective Faith* hath Errours in it, but ours hath none by their own confession: For theirs is all the Decrees of their Popes and Councils: and ours is only the Holy Scripture: which they confess to be infallible. Our own writings do but shew how we understand the Scriptures, and so whether our *subjective faith* be right or not. 2. We confess that it is not only possible but probable, that we are mistaken in some lower points, about the meaning of the Scriptures, and yet our foundation is still sure. But they have in a sort confounded their *Subjective* and *Objective faith*: and one believes it on that account, because others do believe it; and so one age or part do but seek for the *Object* of their *faith* in

the *Actual faith* of the other. Yea, 3. They conclude that every point which is of faith, that is, that's determined by the Church to be so, is of such necessity to salvation that no man can be saved that denyeth it, or that doth not believe it (if sufficiently proposed.) But we are assured, that though all that is in Scripture be most true, yet through misunderstanding, some points there proposed to our faith, may possibly be denyed and disputed against by a true believer; and yet his salvation not be overthrown by it. The Papists cry out against us for distinguishing between the Fundamentals (or essentials) of Religion and the Integrals: but we know it to be necessary.

CHAP. XI.

Detect. 2. When you have brought the matter thus far, and see that if they have one error in faith, their whole cause is lost, then consider, *Whether it be Possible for that Doctrine which is so contrary to Scripture, and to it self, to be free from all Error?* 1. How contrary it is to Scripture, 1. To forbid the reading of Scripture in a known tongue: 2. And their Publick Praying in an unknown language: 3. And their administring the Lords Supper to the people by the halves, denying them the Wine, and giving them the Bread only: 4. And their affirming men to be perfect without sin in this life: 5. And their calling some sins *venial which deserve a pardon*, and yet are truly no sins: 6. And their absolute forbidding their Priests to marry. 7. And saying that there is no Bread and Wine left after the Consecration, with abundance the like: the very reading of the Texts may satisfie you. As for the first, see *Deut.* 6, 7, 8, 9. *Deut.* 11. 18, 19, 20. *Isa.* 34. 16. *Psal.*

Pſal. 1. 2. *Nehem.* 8. *Joſh.* 8. 34, 35. *Matth.* 12. 3, 5. & 19. 4. & 21. 16. & 22. 31. *Mark* 12. 10, 26. *Acts* 8. 28. & 13. 27. & 15. 21. 1 *Theſ.* 5. 27. *Col.* 4. 16. *Deut.* 31. 11. *Eph.* 3. 4. *Matth.* 24. 15. *Rev.* 1. 3. 2 *Tim.* 3. 16. *John* 5. 39. *Acts* 17. 2, 11. & 18. 28. *Rom.* 15. 4. 2 *Tim.* 3. 15. *Iſa.* 8. 16, 20. & 42. 4. *Rom.* 7. 1. *James* 1. 25. *Hoſ.* 8. 12.

For the ſecond, read 1 *Cor.* 14. For the third, ſee *Matth.* 26. 27, 28. 1 *Cor.* 11. 25, 26, 27, 28. 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. For the fourth, ſee *Eccleſ.* 7. 20. *James* 3. 2. 1 *John* 1. 8. *Phil.* 3. 12. *Luke* 11. 4. For the fifth, ſee *Deut.* 12. 32. *Gal.* 3. 10. 1 *John* 3. 4. For the ſixth, ſee 1 *Tim.* 3. 2, 4, 5, 11, 12. *Tit.* 1. 6. 1 *Tim.* 4. 3. 1 *Cor.* 9. 5. For the ſeventh, ſee 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. 1 *Cor.* 11. 23, 26, 27, 28. *Acts* 2. 42. *Acts* 20. 7, 11.

2. And that they are contrary to themſelves, appeareth: 1. In that (as I ſaid before) not only ſeveral perſons, but ſeveral Countreys go ſeveral wayes; the French are of one way, and the Italians of another, even in the Fundamentals of their Faith, which all the reſt is reſolved into. 2. Their Popes have ordinarily been contrary to one another in their Decrees; which made *Platina* ſay, [*Following Popes do ſtill either infringe or wholly abrogate the Decrees of the former Popes*] And *Eraſmus* ſaith, that [*Pope* John 22. *and* Pope Nicholas *are contrary one to another in their whole Decrees, and that in things that ſeem to belong to matter of faith*] Had we no inſtances but of *Sergius* and *Formoſus* and their following partakers, it were enough. And *Celeſtines* caſe puts *Bellarmine* to ſilly ſhifts. 3. That their Councils contradict each other, I have formerly manifeſted. They confeſs that the Arrians have had many Councils as General as moſt ever the Orthodox had: and if it be only the want of the Popes approbation that nullifieth their authority, then let them tell us

no more of *Councils* and of [*all the Church*] but say plainly that it is but *one man* that they mean.

But even their *approved Councils* have been *contrary*: As the sixth Council at *Constantinople* approved by Pope *Adrian*, is now confessed to have many errors. The Council of *Neocæsarea* confirmed by Pope *Leo* 4. and by the *Nicene* Council (as saith the Council of *Florence Sess.* 7.) condemned second marriages, contrary to Scripture and the present Church. The Council at the *Laterane* under *Leo* the tenth determines that the Pope is above a General Council; and the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil* determine that the General Council is above the Pope, and that this is *de fide*, and its heresie to deny it.

CHAP. XII.

Detect. 3. *IF you enter into Dispute with any Papist, enquire first what he will take for sufficient Proof, and what common Principles you are agreed on by which the rest must be decided.* For men that agree in *nothing* at all, are not capable of a dispute. For the Principles in which they are agreed, are those that the rest must be reduced to. And when you have made this enquiry, you shall find that the Popish way of Disputing is to forbid you to Dispute, unless you will first yield the cause to them as beyond dispute: and that they are not agreed with the rest of the world in any common principles to which the differences may be reduced for tryal, and so that there is no sort of proof that they will admit of as sufficient: For if there be any ground of proof at all, it must be 1. From the senses. 2. Or from Reason. 3. Or from Scripture. 4. Or from the Church; but they will stand to none of all these.

1. Begin

1. Begin at the bottom of all, and know of them whether they will take that for a Valid proof, which is fetcht from ſenſe, even from the ſoundeſt ſenſes of all men in the world, ſuppoſing a convenient object and *Medium*? If they will not take this for proof, how can you diſpute with them? Or what proof can be admitted, if this be not admitted? We have this advantage in dealing even with thoſe Heathen that have blotted out much of the Law of Nature it ſelf, that yet they will yield to an Argument from ſenſe.

But if they would yield to the Validity of this proof, then they give away their cauſe, ſeeing *ſenſe* telleth us that it is *bread* which we ſee, and feel, and eat after the Conſecration. They know this; and therefore they muſt diſown and deny this ſort of proof.

2. But will they then admit of proofs from *Reaſon*? No, that cannot be, if proof from ſenſe be not admitted. For *Reaſon* receiveth its object by means or occaſion of the *ſenſes*, and muſt needs be deceived if *it* be deceived: And *Reaſon* hath not a principle that it holds faſter, than *that ſenſe is to be credited*; that this is white or black which my own eyes and the eyes of all other men do ſee to be ſo: and ſo that this is bread which we all ſee, and feel, and taſte to be ſo. And therefore the Papiſts tell us that *Reaſon muſt ſtoop to faith*, that is, they will not ſtand to *Reaſon* when it contradicteth the doctrine of their Sect. It ſeems they are in ſome parts of their Religion *unreaſonable*. But I would know, whether they have *any Reaſon to be unreaſonable*. If they *have*, then why might not *our Reaſon* be valid as well as *their Reaſon* which they bring *againſt Reaſon*? by which they contradict themſelves. For if *Reaſon* be vain, why *Reaſon* they to prove its Vanity or invalidity? But if they have *no Reaſon againſt Reaſon*, let them confeſs it, and offer us none, and then their diſputes will do no

harm. We eaſily yield, that we have *Reaſon to believe Gods Revelations*, about thoſe things which *we had no Reaſon to believe* if they were not *Revealed:* And that many of thoſe *Revelations* are *above Reaſon*, ſo far as that *Reaſon* cannot diſcern the truth of the thing *without them*; yea, it would rather judge the things *improbable:* But yet *Revelations* are *received* by *Reaſon*, and *inform Reaſon*, and not *deſtroy it*; nor do they *ſo contradict Senſe* or *Reaſon*, as to make that *credible* which *Senſe* and *Reaſon* have *ſufficient ground* to judge *falſe*.

So that here we muſt break with a Papiſt, even where we might joyn in diſpute with a Heathen. And how will Papiſts deal with Heathens if they will deny the proofs from *Senſe and Reaſon?*

3. But will they ſtand to the Validity of *Proofs* from Scripture? No: For, 1. They take it to be but part of Gods Word, ſo that we may not argue *Negatively*, [*It is not in the holy Scripture: therefore it is not an Article of Faith or a Law of God*] For they will preſently appeal to *Tradition*, *&c.* And even ſo much as is in Scripture, though they confeſs it to be true, yet they confeſs it not to be by us intelligible, and will not admit of any proof from it but with this limitation, that you take it in that ſenſe as the Church takes it. For they are ſworn by the *Trent* Oath [*to take it in that ſenſe as the Holy Mother Church doth hold, and hath held it in, and never to take or interpret it, but according to the unanimous ſenſe of the Fathers.*] So that they muſt know what ſenſe all the Fathers are unanimous in before they can admit a proof from Scripture. And before that can be done, above a Cart-load of Books muſt be read over or ſearched: and when that's done, they will find that moſt Texts were never medled with by moſt of thoſe Fathers in their Writings; and in thoſe that they did

meddle

meddle with, they disagreed in multitudes, and where they *disagree* they are not *unanimous*; and there the Papists are sworn to believe no sense at all. And if they would have come down to a Major vote, it is no short or easie matter to gather the votes. And if they know the Fathers unanimous consent, yet must they have the sense of the present Church too: And is it not all one to make your adversary the *Judge of your cause*, as the *Judge of your Evidences and all your proofs?*

4. Well, but at least may we not hope that they will stand to the Judgement of the *Catholick Church?* And if so, we will not take it for our adversary. No: they will not do so neither. For 1. When they deny proof from *sense* and *reason*, they must needs deny all that's brought from the Church: For the Church cannot judge it self but on supposition of the infallibility of sense. 2. And when you argue from the judgement and practice of the greater part of the Church, they presently disclaim them all as Hereticks or Schismaticks, and will have no man be a Valid witness but themselves. The Greeks, the Æthiopians, the Armenians, the Protestants, all are Hereticks or Schismaticks save they; and therefore may not be witnesses in the case. So that you see upon what terms we stand with the Papists, that will admit of no proofs upon the Infallibility of *Sense or Reason*, or the *sufficiency of Scripture*, or the *testimony of the Catholick Church*, but only from *themselves*.

CHAP. XIII.

Detect. 4. *Understand what the Papists mean when they are still calling to you for a Judge of Controversies.*

If you would dispute with them, they are presently asking you, [*Who shall be the Judge?*] and perswading you that it is in vain to dispute without a living Judge: for every man will be the Judge himself; and every mans cause will be right in his own eyes, and all the world will be still at odds till we are agreed who shall be the Judge.

To help you to see the sense of this deceit, and then to confute it; 1. You may easily observe that this is the plain drift of all, to perswade you to make them your Judges, and yield the cause instead of disputing it. For it is no other Judge but themselves that they will admit. Yield first that the Pope or his Council is the Judge of all controversies, and then its folly to dispute against them: so that if you will yield them the cause first, they will then dispute with you after.

2. But what is to be said to the pretence of the Necessity of a Judge? I answer, 1. Its against all reason and experience to think that all enquiries or disputes are vain, unless there be a Judge to decide the case. A Judge is a Ruling decider; not to satisfie mens minds, so much as to preserve Order, and Peace, and Justice in the Society. But there are thousands of cases to be privately discussed, that we never need to bring to a Judge. Every Husbandman, and Tradesman, and Navigator, and other Artificer doth meet with doubts and difficulties in his way which he laboureth to Discern, and satisfieth himself with a Judgement of Discretion without

without a Ruling Judge. We eat, and drink, and clothe our selves, and follow our daily labours without a Judge, though we meet with controversies in almost all, what meat or drink is best for quality or quantity, and a hundred like doubts. Men do marry, and build, and buy, and sell, and take Physick, and dispatch their greatest worldly business without a Judge. Judges are only for such controverted cases as cannot well be decided without them, to the *attaining of the Ends of Government*.

2. Is it not against the daily practice of the Papists to think or say that all disputes and controversies must have a Judge? Who is the Judge between the Nominals, Reals and Formalists, the Dominicans, Franciscans and Jesuites, in all those controversies which have Cart-loads of Books written on them? Their Pope or Councils dare not Judge between them. Do they not daily dispute in their Schools among themselves without a Judge? and still write Books against one another without a Judge?

3. Understand well the use and differences of Judgement. The *sentence* is but a *means* to the *execution:* and Judges cannot determine the *mind and will of man:* but preserve *outward Order*, if men *will not* see the truth themselves. Methinks the Jesuits that are so eager for free-will, should easily grant that the Pope by his definition cannot determine the *Will* of man. And they see that *Heretick̃s remain Heretick̃s*, when the Pope hath said all that he can: And if he can cure them all by his determinations, he is much too blame that he doth not. And if a mans *mind* be to be setled, an *Infallible Teacher* is fitter than a Judge. *Judgement* then being *for Execution*, when you ask, *Who shall be the Judge?* I answer that *Judgement* is either *total, absolute and final:* or it is only *to a certain particular*

cular end, limited, and *ſubordinate,* from which there is an Appeal. In the former caſe, there is no Judge but Chriſt, and the Father by him. No abſolute deciſion can be made till the great Judgement come; and then all will be fully and finally decided. And for the *limited preſent Judgements of men,* they are of *ſeveral ſorts* according to their *ſeveral Ends.* When the queſtion is, *Who ſhall be corporally puniſhed as an Heretick? the Magiſtrate is Judge:* For *coercive puniſhment* being his work, the *Judgement* muſt be *his* alſo. But when the queſtion is, *Who ſhall be excommunicated as an Heretick?* as Gods Law hath told us who *in ſpecie,* and ſo is the *Rule* of deciſion about individuals: ſo to try individual perſons, and caſes according to this Law, belongs to the *Governours of the Church:* but not to the *Governours* of *other Churches a thouſand miles off,* that never received ſuch an authority, and are not capable of the work: but to the *Governours of the Church in which the party hath Communion,* and into which he ſhall at any time intrude and ſeek communion. And *all men* have a *Judgement of diſcerning* that are concerned in the *Execution.*

So that if a diſputing Papiſt will ſay that his buſineſs is not to Diſpute with you, but to *Excommunicate,* or *hang,* or *burn you* for an *Heretick,* then I confeſs, its all the reaſon in the world that you ſhould firſt agree of the *Judge.* But why the Pope ſhould be the Judge, I know not, unleſs it be in his own charge.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

Detect. 5. WHen you have proceeded on theſe grounds, the Papiſts will tell you, that *in their way there is an End of Controverſies, but in yours there is none: For if you will not ſtand to ones Judgement as infallible, you may diſpute as long as you live before you come to an End.*

To direct you in diſcuſſing this part of the *Deceit* alſo: 1. We confeſs that on earth there will be no End of all controverſies among the beſt: nor of the great controverſies which ſalvation lyeth on, between the believers and the unbelievers: that is, there will be ſtill Infidelity and Hereſie in the world, and error in the godly themſelves. 1. Hath it not been ſo in every age till now? And why ſhould we expect that it ſhould now be otherwiſe? 2. Doth not *Paul* tell us that here *we know but in part, and propheſie in part?* and when is it that that which is *imperfect will be done away*, but when *that which is perfect is come?* While we know but in part, we ſhall differ in part.

2. Hath your way put an End to controverſies any more than ours? Are you not yet at controverſie with *Infidels, Whether Chriſt be the Redeemer*, and with *Hereticks whether he be true eternal God?* Are you not yet as full of controverſies among your ſelves, as any Chriſtians on the face of the earth? I do not believe but in the many Volumes of your Schoolmen, Caſuiſts, and Commentators, I can ſhew more controverſies yet depending, than you can find amongſt any ſort of Chriſtians in the world; yea, than you can find among all other Chriſtians in the world ſet together.

3. And

3. And is there any thing in *your way* that better tendeth to the deciding of controversies than *in ours?* Nothing at all; but contrarily, you have made more Controversies than you have ended. For, 1. We have a *Certain infallible Rule* to decide our controversies by, even such as you confess your selves to be infallible; even the Holy Scriptures: But you have an uncertain Rule, even the Decrees of your Popes and Councils, and the many Volumes of the Fathers, which are at odds among themselves; your very *Rule* is self-contradicting, and your Judges are together by the ears (as hath been shewed.)

2. *Our Faith* consisteth in those points which are granted by your selves, and so are beyond Controversie between us and you. But *yours* lyeth also in a mixture of mens corruptions, which will ever be controverted and condemned.

3. *Our Faith* consisteth in the few antient Articles by which the Church was alwayes known (as to its essentials.) But *you* confound the *Essentials* with the *integrals:* and the *Number* of your necessary Articles is so great, as must needs be matter of more controversie than ours.

4. We know our Religion, and where to find it: For it is perfect at the first, and receiveth no additions or diminutions. One generation cometh, and another goeth, but the Word of the Lord endureth for ever. But *you* never know when you have all, because you know not when your Pope will have done defining: that is an article of faith *to you* one year that was none the year before, nor ever before.

5. *We* need no Judge to decide any controversies among us in the points of Absolute necessity to salvation: both because the Scripture is so plain in those points, as to serve for decision without a Judge; and because we abhor to make a controversie of any

of

of them; and where there is no *controverſie*, there needs *no Judge*. We are all agreed, through the plainneſs of the Scripture, that there is but one, Eternal, moſt Wiſe, and Good, and Omnipotent God; and that there is one Mediator between God and man, who is himſelf both God and man, that was crucified, dead, buried, went to ἅδης, roſe again, aſcended, intercedeth for us, and is King and Head of the Church: and will raiſe the dead, and judge the world, ſome to Heaven, and ſome to Hell: Theſe and all the reſt of the Eſſentials of our faith, and many more points that are not eſſentials, are ſo plain in Scripture, that we are paſt making them matter of Controverſie. If any man deny an Eſſential point of faith, he is none of us, no more than of you. But you are it ſeems ſo deep in infidelity, that you muſt have a Judge to decide your Controverſies in the neceſſary Articles of Faith. For whatever is *de fide*, you make to be of ſuch equal neceſſity, that you deride our diſtinguiſhing the Fundamentals from the reſt, (as may be ſeen in *Knots* Infidelity unmaskt againſt *Chillingworth*). Seriouſly tell us, Do you think Chriſtians need a Judge, or muſt put it to a Judge to decide, *whether Chriſt be the Meſſias or not? whether he dyed and roſe again or not? Whether he will judge the world or not?* or any ſuch points. If he be a Judge, he muſt have power to oblige you to ſtand to his Determination on which ſide ſoever he determine. And what if *John* 22. determine that the ſoul is not immortal, or *John* 23. that there is no reſurrection or life to come, but a man dyeth like a Beaſt: would you ſtand to this deciſion?

6. If you ſay that your Judge hath power to oblige you only on one ſide, that is, when he judgeth right (and ſo make no Judge of him, but a Teacher), we have ſuch Judges as well as you, even Teachers to ſhew us the Evidence of truth.

7. If

7. If you ſay that you have a *Judge to determine of Hereſies in order to the Puniſhing of them by the ſword:* So have we as well as you, and better than you. For your Pope is a Prieſt that hath nothing to do with the ſword, (at leaſt out of his own Principalities): but our Princes and other Rulers are lawful Magiſtrates, that are appointed to be a terror to evil doers, *Rom.* 13. 4, 6.

8. If you ſay that you *have a Judge to determine of Hereſie in Order to Excommunication*, ſo have we in every Church: even the Paſtors of the Churches, who are bound to unite and aſſiſt each other in ſuch works. *What is to be accounted Hereſie*, the Law of God ſufficiently determineth: *And what particular perſons are to be Judged Heretick and excommunicated according to that Law*, the particular Paſtors that are on the place can better decide, than a Pope that is a thouſand, or five thouſand miles off, and cannot hear the witneſſes. And do you not your ſelves decide almoſt all ſuch caſes through the world (that is of your ſubjection) by the preſent Paſtors or Biſhops, and not by the Pope? And why may not we do ſo then as well as you?

9. But if you lay all upon your Popes or Councils Infallibility, I deſire you but to read my third Diſputation in a Book againſt Popery, called the *Safe Religion*; and then believe that Infallibility if you can. I ſhould think my ſelf a miſerable man, if I were not my ſelf more Infallible than many of your Popes have been. Every Chriſtian (while ſuch) is infallible in his belief of the Chriſtian faith; And the Scripture is an infallible ground of our belief.

10. Is it not a plain Judgement of God upon you, that while you make the Scripture ſo dark and not intelligible, and cry up the Neceſſity of a living Judge, you ſhould not only ſwarm with differences among your ſelves, but ſhould be utterly diſagreed, and at a loſs

a loſs to know *who is this Judge of Controverſies*; one ſaying *it is the Pope*, and another that *its the Council*: and what the better are you for ſaying, *There muſt be a Judge*, as long as you cannot tell *Who it muſt be?* Its not only uncertain among you, *Whether Pope or Council be the Infallible Judge*, but alſo *which is a true Pope*, and *which is a lawful General Council?* For fourty years at leaſt together, the Church could not know the true Pope, but the more learned and conſcionable men were divided: Nor is it known to this day. Frequently the ſtrongeſt hath carried it, and ſucceſs been his beſt title. Nay, General Councils themſelves knew not the right Pope. The Council at *Conſtance* and *Baſil* knew not the right Pope. They at *Baſil* thought *Felix* the fifth the true Pope, and *Eugenius* no Pope: But friends and ſtrength confuted a General Council, and proved depoſed *Eugenius* the Pope. And for Councils themſelves, who knows which to take for currant and of Authority? What Catalogues have you of *reprobated Councils*, and of *doubtful Councils*, and *partly approved, partly reprobate*, and who knows which and *how far*; but only *that is approved, that pleaſeth the Pope, and that reprobate that diſpleaſeth him*, and yet perhaps approved by a former Pope: So that you are all in a confuſion and uncertain about your true Popes and General Councils.

And if you knew them, yet what a loſs are you at to know their Decrees and Canons? What a Fardel of falſe Decretal Epiſtles have you thruſt upon the world, as *Blondell*, *Dalleus*, *Reignolds* and others have fully proved: Forſooth Decretals that uſe a Tranſlation of the Scripture that was formed a long time after the death of the ſuppoſed Authors of thoſe Epiſtles: And Decretals which make mention of perſons and things that were many ſcore or hundred years after the death of the

ſaid

said Authors. These are your new Scriptures, and by these our faith must be regulated, and our controversies decided.

And your Canons are abundance of them as uncertain: some of your own will have but twenty Canons of the first General Council at *Nice*: some will have the new found rabble of additions. Much more uncertainty or certain forgery there is in the Canons called the Apostles: and the like we may say of abundance more.

And now I appeal to all the impartial Reason in the world, whether your voluminous, apocryphal, uncertain faith that needs a living Judge, and cannot find one, or agree upon him, and that leaves your controversies still undecided, be a liker way to peace and unity, than our short and plain Articles and infallible Scripture faith, that hath less matter of contention, and better means to prevent it, even faithful Teachers and Judges in every Church and Commonwealth, which shall so far determine as may preserve the peace of those societies, leaving the final full Decision of all to the Eternal Judge that is even at the door.

11. Yea, and is not Gods hand of Judgement yet more observable against you, that when your Popes and Councils have past their judgement, the several Sects are unable to understand them? witness the late sentence against the *Jansenists*, of which the persons that seem to be condemned, say, that there is no such thing or words in all *Jansenius* writings, as the Pope saith are in him, and condemneth as his: and the Controversie is as far from a decision, as if the Pope had held his peace. Yea, your great Disputer here in *England*, *Thomas White* the Noveliſt, is the same for all the Popes determination.

Take another instance in the forementioned Case, *Whether the Pope or Council be supream?* The Councils of *Constance*

Conſtance and *Baſil* determined it one way as *de fide*, and yet that made no end of the Controverſie. The Council of *Lateran* and Pope *Leo* determined it the other way; and yet it is a Controverſie after two contrary deciſions: and ſome ſay one way and ſome the other: and ſome ſay, *It is yet undecided* (for fear of angring the French by caſting them off as Hereticks). Another inſtance. The Council at *Baſil Seſſ.* 36. (*pag.* 80. in *Binnius*) hath fully determined the Controverſie between the *Franciſcans* and *Dominicans* about the Virgin *Maries* immaculate conception: and yet it is undetermined ſtill; and *Thomas White* preſumes to affirm, that [*Certainly there is no Tradition for it, nor any probability that ever the Negative will be defined.* Apolog. *for* Tradit. pag. 64. 65, 66.] yea he carryeth it as boldly out, as if never Council had made or medled with it. I will therefore recite the words of the Council, which are theſe [*A hard queſtion hath been in divers parts, and before this holy Synod, about the Conception of the glorious Virgin* Mary, *and the beginning of her Sanctification; ſome ſaying that the Virgin and her ſoul was for ſome time or inſtant of time actually under Original ſin: others on the contrary, ſaying, that from the beginning of her Creation, God loving her, gave her grace by which preſerving and freeing that bleſſed perſon from the Original ſpot —— We, having diligently lookt into the authorities and reaſons, which for many years paſt have in publick relation on both ſides been alledged before this holy Synod, and having ſeen many other things about it, and weighed them by mature conſideration, do Define and Declare, that the doctrine affirming that the glorious Virgin* Mary *the Mother of God, by the ſingular preventing and operating grace of God, was never actually under Original ſin, but was ever free from all Original and actual ſin, and was holy and immaculate, is*

to be approved, held and embraced of all Catholicks as godly and Consonant to Church-worship, Catholick faith, right reason, and sacred Scripture: and that henceforth it shall be lawful for no man to preach and teach the contrary] Is not this plain Defining?

Obj. *But this was not an approved Council. Answ.* 1. It was owned by Pope *Eugenius* himself. And here once for all I prove that the Council of *Basil* was approved by the Pope: for Pope *Felix* the fifth (one of the best Popes that ever *Rome* had this thousand years) approved it in this point: not only by accepting their election, but in expres terms [*professing firmly to hold the faith of the Councils of* Constance *and* Basil, *and to keep it inviolate to a tittle, and confirm it with his soul and blood: promising faithfully to labour to defend the Catholick faith, and for the execution and observation of the Decrees of the Councils of* Constance *and* Basil, *swearing to prosecute the celebration of General Councils, and confirmation of Elections, according to the Decrees of the holy Council of* Basil] See *Binnius Sess.* 40. *page* 87. If they say that *Felix* was not a true Pope: I answer, then *Martin* the fifth chosen by the Council at *Constance* was no true Pope; and then where is your succession? These things are plain and cannot be denyed, though unconscionable shifters, that argue according to their Wills, may find words to beguile the simple.

2. It seems then your Catholick Church representative is nothing *if one man like it not.*

One more instance: How largely hath the Council of *Trent* dealt about Original sin: And yet the foresaid *Thomas White ibid.* saith thus [*If the People were taught Original sin is nothing but a Disposition to evil, or a natural weakness, which unless prevented brings infallibly sin and damnation: and that in it self it deserves neither*

ther reproach nor punishment, as long as it proceeds not to actual sin, the heat of vulgar devotion would be cooled, &c.] See here a meer *Pelagian* issue of all the Determinations about Original sin, which they should swear to believe.

CHAP. XV.

Detect. 6. AND by this that hath been said, you may see what to think of *their glorying in their Unity, and accusing our Divisions.* One of the principal arguments that they prevail by, is by telling the people into how many Sects we are divided; and that the Catholick Church is but one: but we are many: And here they will tell you of all the names they can reckon up, Presbyterians, Independants, Anabaptists, Antinomians, Arminians, Socinians, Quakers, and what not. And they will tell you that all this Division comes by departing from the Roman Catholick Church; every man being left to be of what Religion his fancy leadeth him to, for want of an universal Judge of controversies. And they will ask you what reason you have among all these Sects to believe one of them rather than another? So that they would perswade you that there is no way for Unity but by turning to be Papists, that we may be united in the Pope of *Rome.*

To all this deceit (for it is no better) we give them our full answer in these Propositions. 1. It is not every kind of Unity that is desirable: but Unity with truth, and honesty, and safety. Its easier to agree in evil than in good: for evil findeth more friendship with corrupted nature, and hath more servants in the world. The wicked are more agreed, and far more in number, of one mind, than the Godly are. The Mahometans are

far more agreed; and that in a far greater number, than the Papists are. The Devils have some agreement in their way: They are all agreed to hate Christ and his members, and to seek night and day whom they may devour. It is easier to agree in a Papists work than in ours: To center carnally in a sinful (and oft a most wicked) man; to agree in certain forms and ceremonies, which flesh and blood is glad to delude themselves with, instead of the Life of faith and Love; its easie to agree in such a carnal Religion. To spare the labour and time of study and searching after truth, and to cast their souls upon the faith of others, even the Pope or a Council, this is an easie thing for lazy ungodly men to agree in: But to make the Truth our Own, and get the Law of Christ written in our own hearts, and to live upon it, and walk in the light, and embrace all those truths that are most against our fleshly inclination and intereſt, this is not so easie for corrupted nature to agree upon.

2. Christ hath told us that it is *a little flock to whom he gives the Kingdom*, Luke 12. 32. and that *the gate is strait, and way narrow that leads to life, and few there be that find it; and the gate is wide and the way broad that leads to destruction, and many there be that enter at it.* And therefore it is no great wonder if error and sin have the greater number.

3. And yet for all this I dare boldly say that there is a far more excellent Unity and Concord among the true Reformed Catholicks, than among the Papists, and that they do but cheat poor souls with the false pretence of Unity. And this I shall make appear to you as followeth.

1. As I have said before, they are utterly divided and disagreed about that very power in which they should unite, and which they pretend must agree them in

in all other things. One half of them are for the Soveraignty of a Pope, and the other of a General Council: and that as a point of faith. So that there is no possibility of union with them, that are divided in the very point in which they invite us to Unite with them. If the eye be dark how shall the body see? If they cannot agree about that power that they say must agree them in all things else, what hope of an agreement with them?

But for our parts we are all agreed that Christ only is the head of the Church, and in him we all Unite.

2. With us, they are usually but here and there a straggling person, or some few half-witted self-conceited Novices that fall off and disagree from us in any thing that destroyeth salvation: But with the Papists Princes are against Princes, and Nations against Nations, and which is much more, General Councils against General Councils, even in the Foundation of their faith. So that let the General Councils be never so full and learned, and justly called, yet if they be against the Popes Soveraignty over them, the other party call them but *Conciliabula*, false Councils and Conventicles. Of how great moment this difference is, let the learned *Cajetane* be a witness, who in his Oration in the Council at the *Laterane*, under *Leo* 10. inveighing against the Councils at *Pisa*, *Constance* and *Basil*, makes one to be *Babel*, and the other *Jerusalem*.

3. As I proved before, the Papists are divided into two several pretended Catholick Churches, by making themselves two Soveraigns: but so are not we: For we have but one Head Jesus Christ. That they are two Churches (besides what is said) hear the words of *Cajetane* in the foresaid Oration (*in Bin. p.* 552.) [*This Novelty of* Pisa, *sprung up at* Constance, *and vanished. At* Basil *it sprung up again and is exploded: and if you be men, it will now also be repressed as it was*

under Eugenius *the fourth. For it cometh not from heaven, and therefore will not be lasting. Nor doth it embrace the Principality of that One, who is in the Church triumphant, and preserveth the Church militant; and which the Synod of* Pisa *ought to embrace if it came from heaven, and not, as it doth, to rely on the Government of a multitude. The Church of the* Pisans *therefore doth far differ from this Church of Christ. For one is the Church of Believers; the other of Cavillers: One of the houshold of God; the other of the Erroneous: One (is the Church) of Christian men: the other of such as fear not to tear the coat of Christ, and divide the mystical members of Christ from his mystical b[illegible]*] This was spoken in Council with applause. And can there yet be greater divisions than these?

4. They have been utterly divided about the very power of chooſing their Pope, in whom they muſt unite. In one age the *People* choſe him: In another the *Clergy* choſe him; Sometime *both together*: For a long time the *Emperours* choſe him: At laſt only the *Cardinals* choſe him. And ſometime a *General Council* hath choſen him. *Our Catholick Church* hath no ſuch uncertain Head, but one that's the ſame yeſterday to day and for ever.

5. They have often had two or three Popes at once, and one part of the Church hath followed one, and another the other: yea (as is ſaid, for forty years together, none knew the true Pope) ſaith *Cajetane ubi ſup.* [*Of the Schiſm of that time there were three ſo accounted Popes, that none of them might be eſteemed the Succeſſor of* Peter *either certain, or without ambiguity.*] For many ages one part hath been running after one, and the other after the other, or ſtriving about them. But we are all agreed in our Head without Controverſie.

6. They

6. They have killed multitudes of persons in their divisions about the choice of their Pope (as in *Damasus* choice.) And they have had many bloody wars to the dividing of the Church about their Popes, and between Pope and Pope. This was their Unity. It would make a Christian ashamed and grieved to read of the lamentable wars and divisions of Christendom, either between or about their Popes.

7. Their Popes and Christian Emperour, Kings and Princes, have been in yet longer and more grievous wars.

8. They have set Princes against Princes, and Nations against Nations in wars about the *Causes* of the Popes for many ages together: and it is too seldom otherwise.

9. They have set Kings and their own subjects together in wars, as *England* and almost all Christendom hath known by sad experience.

10. They have Excommunicated Princes, and encouraged their subjects to expel them, and to murder them: hence were the inhumane murders of *Henry* the third, and *Henry* the fourth, Kings of *France*; and the Powder Plot, and many Treasons in *England:* This is their Unity.

11. They center and unite the Church in an impotent, insufficient Head, that is not able to do the Office of a Head, to the hundredth part of the Church, and therefore cannot possibly preserve unity. But our Head is all-sufficient.

12. They set up not only a Controverted Head, which all the Churches never agreed to, nor ever will do, but also a false usurping Head, which the Churches dare not and ought not to unite in. Whereas Jesus Christ is beyond controversie the just and lawful Head of the Church.

13. Your Agreement and Unity is with none but your own sect: and is this so great a matter to boast of? You divide your selves from most of the Catholick Church, and cast them off as Hereticks, or Schismaticks; and then boast of a Unity among your selves. And so may the Quakers, the Anabaptists, the Socinians, as well as you: Or if you magnifie your Unity from the greatness of your number that agree, the Greek Church also is numerous: and yet in this we far exceed you. For the true Catholick is in Union with all the Members of Christ on earth. We lay our Unity on the Essentials of Christianity, and so are united with all true Christians in the world: even with many of them that reproach us: when you laying your Unity on I know not how many doubtful points, yea, on you know not what your selves, can extend it no further than to your sect. Which is the more notable and glorious Unity? to be United to the truly Catholick body, containing all true Christians in the world, or to be at Unity with a sect, which is the lesser and more corrupted part of the Church?

14. With what face can Papists glory in their Unity, that are the greatest Dividers of the Church on earth? Who is it that condemneth the greatest part of the Church, and prosecuteth that condemnation with fire and sword, or so much vehemence, as the Papists do? when they have most audaciously divided themselves from all others, and arrogated the title of Catholicks to themselves, they call this abominable Schism by the name of Unity. If you say that the Reformers have divided themselves from all others too: I answer, not as from Hereticks, or no members of the same body with us, as you do: but only as from unsound mistaken Brethren: And therefore properly we are not divided from them, but only from their mistakes. We think

it

it not lawful to joyn with the deareſt Brethren in ſinning, or in that worſhip (by perſonal local communion) where we cannot keep our innocency: But yet we hold the unity of the Spirit with them in the bond of Peace: and are one with them in all the ſubſtance of Chriſtianity, and holy worſhip. Even where diſtance of place, or circumſtantial differences keep us from Communion in the ſame Aſſemblies; yet our ſeveral Aſſemblies have Communion in faith, and Love, and the ſubſtance of worſhip as to the kind: ſo that our diviſion from other Chriſtians is nothing to the Papiſts.

15. But yet when any differ from us in any point Eſſential to our Religion (that is, to Chriſtianity,) they are none of us, nor owned by us; and therefore you cannot ſay that we are at difference among our ſelves, becauſe ſome Apoſtates have faln off from us. You will not allow us to ſay, you have many ſects, becauſe ſome of you have turned Socinians, or becauſe thouſands of yours have turned to the Reformers, in the days of *Luther*, *Calvin*, *&c.* And why then ſhould thoſe ſects be numbred with us that are not of us, but went out from us? If men turn Infidels, Seekers, Quakers, Socinians, *&c.* they are not of us no more than of you. If you ſay that we bred them: I anſwer, no more than you breed them, when they turn to the ſame ſects from you: Nor no more than you bred the Lutherans, far better men. They went out from you, and yet you bred them not: But on the other ſide, you cheriſh thoſe as part of your Church, which differ from you in your *fundamentals*; ſo that the Pope dare not unchurch or diſown them (as the French, *&c.*) But ſo do not we.

16. Our Unity is in *Poſitives*, and theirs is in *Negatives:* Ours is a Unity in faith; and theirs is *in not believing*

lieving the contrary : And so dead men, may have a fuller Unity in the grave than the Papists have.

17. Our Union is Divine, having a Divine Head and Center, and Divine Doctrine and Law in which we agree. But the Papists is humane, having a carnal Head and Center, and Humane Decrees and Canons for its matter and Rule.

18. They have not so sure a means of retaining men in their Unity as we have: Let experience be Judge of this: For where one hath forsaken our Unity and Communion, I suppose hundreds, if not thousands, have forsaken theirs, as *France*, *Belgia*, *Germany*, *Sweden*, *Denmark*, *Poland*, *Hungary*, *Transilvania*, *England*, *Scotland*, *Ireland*, *&c.* can witness: and if themselves might be believed, the Greek Church, and all, or almost all the Christians else in the world have gone from their Unity. And yet will they glory in the effectualness of their means of Unity? Why then did they not retain all these Nations in their Unity?

19. Moreover, indeed they have very little Religious Unity at all among them; for its force and terror that keeps men in their Church: And who can tell under such violence how many stick to them in Conscience and willingly? He that will forsake their Religion in *Spain*, must be tormented and burnt at a stake, and in other Countrys where they have full power, he must be at least undone. So that 1. Theirs is a Unity of bodies more than of minds: 2. And their Union is not procured by the Pope as Pope; but by the temporal sword, which the Pope hath usurped over some Countrys, and which deluded Princes use by his perswasion in other Countrys. What a jugling deceit then is this, to perswade poor souls, that the only way to Unity is to Center in the Pope of *Rome*, and that this is the most effectual means of ending differences! when in the mean time

time they make so little use of it, and place so little confidence in it themselves, but uphold their unity by the *Magistrates sword?* And if this be the way, we have *Magistrates* among us as well as they, that can as effectually compel men to unity, as far as their Judgements tell them it is fit: And besides this force, it is the riches and preferment of their Clergy, with their immunity from secular power, and the like, that is the means of their unity. But it is the light of holy Scripture opened by a faithful Ministry, and countenanced by Christian Magistracy without Tyranny, that is our means of unity.

If the Papal Headship be so effectual a means of unity as they pretend, and if they are so much of a mind as they say, let them give us leave but to preach one 12. months in *Spain* and *Italy* if they dare: or let them give men leave without fire and sword to choose their Religion.

20. And yet besides all this, and after all this Tyranny, they have more difference among themselves than we have, or than all the Christians that I hear of in the world. And to hide the Infamy of their differences, they tolerate them, and extenuate them. For differences in Discipline, and order of Worship, they allow abundance of Sects called *Orders*, that men and women may choose which they please. And the voluminous differences of their Schoolmen, Casuists and Commentators, they say are not in matters of faith. But call them what you will, they are many of them greater differences than are with us. I pray read over the *Jansenians* Mysterie of Jesuitism, and take notice of the differences between the Jesuites and them in Case-Divinity, and judge whether they be small. And let it not offend your ears if I recite some of their Differences in that Papists own words, as he cites the

the Jesuites, and tells you where to find what he saith.

Pap. 89. *Filiutius* the Jesuite holds, that *if a man have purposely wearied himself with satisfying a whore, that he might be dispensed with from fasting on a fasting day, he is not obliged to fast*, But the Jansenians think otherwise.

Basilius Pontius & Bauny the Jesuites teach, that *a man may seek an opportunity of sinning* primò & per se, *when the spiritual or temporal concernment of our selves or our neighbours inclineth him thereto*, But the Jansenists think the contrary: *Pag.* 91.

Eman. Sa the Jesuite holds, that [*a man may do what he conceives lawful according to a probable opinion, though the contrary be the more certain: and for this the Opinion of one grave Doctor is sufficient.*] And *Filiutius* the Jesuite held [*that it is lawful to follow the less probable opinion, though it be the less certain; and that this is the common opinion of modern authors*] *Pag.* 95. And yet the Jansenists are against it.

Layman the Jesuite holds, that [*If it be more favourable to them that ask advice of him, and more desired, it is Prudence to give them such advice as is held probable by some knowing person, though he himself be convinced that it is absolutely false.*] But the Jansenists are against this. *Pag.* 96.

Bauny the Jesuite holds [*that when the penitent follows a probable opinion, the confessor is bound to absolve him, though his judgment be contrary to that of the penitent: and that he sins mortally if he deny him absolution*] *Myster. of Jesuit. pag.* 97. But the Jansenists deny this.

Father *Reginaldus* and *Cellot* hold, that [*the modern Casuists in questions of Morality are to be preferred before the antient Fathers, though they were nearer*

nearer the Apoſtles times] *Pag.* 98. But the Janſeniſts think otherwiſe.

Pope *Gregory* the fourteenth declared Murtherers unworthy to have Sanctuary in Churches. But the Jeſuits and Janſeniſts agree not who are the Murtherers. The 29 Jeſuites in their *Praxis* pag. 600. by Murtherers underſtand [*thoſe who have taken money to kill one treacherouſly : and that thoſe who kill without receiving any reward, but do it only to oblige their friends, are not called Murtherers.*] But the Janſeniſts think otherwiſe. (No marvail if you cannot underſtand the Scripture without a judge, when you can no better underſtand your judge, no not what he means by a Murtherer.)

Vaſquez the Jeſuite ſaith [*that in this Queſtion, rich men are obliged to give alms out of their ſuperfluity; though the affirmative be true, yet it will ſeldom or never happen, that it is obligatory in point of practice*] *Pag.* 105. But the Janſeniſts think otherwiſe.

Valentia the Jeſuite, *Tom.* 3. *pag.* 2042. holds, that [*If a man give money not as the price of a Benefice, but as a Motive to reſign it, it is not* Simony, *though he that reſigns do look at the money as his Principal end.*] and ſo *Tannerus, p.* 115. But the Janſeniſts think otherwiſe.

Father *Gaſper Hurtado* ſaith [*that an Incumbent may without mortal ſin wiſh the death of him that hath a penſion out of his living, and a ſon his fathers death; and may rejoyce when it happens, ſo it proceed only from a conſideration of the advantage accrewing to him thereby, and not out of any perſonal hatred*] *Pag.* 136. But the Janſeniſts believe not this.

Layman the Jeſuit, and *Pet. Hurtado:* thinks *that a man may lawfully fight a duel, accepting the challenge*

to defend his honour or estate, Pag. 138. But the Jansenist thinks otherwise.

Sanchez and Navarrus allow a man *to murder his adversary secretly, or dispatch him at unawares to avoid the danger of a duel: pag.* 140. And *Molina* thinks *you may kill one that wrongfully informs against us in any Court: and* Reginaldus, *that you may kill the false witnesses which the prosecutor brings*; And *Tannerus* and *Emanuel Sa*, that *you may kill both witnesses and judge which conspire the death of an innocent person*; But so think not the Jansenists.

Henriquez saith [*one man may kill another who hath given him a box on the ear, though he run away for it, provided he do it not out of hatred or revenge, and that by that means a gap be open for excessive murther, destructive to the State. And the reason is, a man may as well do it in pursuance of his reputation, as his goods; and he that hath had a box on the ear is accounted dishonourable till he hath killed his enemy.*] And *Azorius* saith, [*Is it lawful for a person of quality to kill one that would give him a box on the ear, or a bang with a stick? Some say not* ——— *But others affirm it lawful, and for my part I think it probable, when it cannot be avoided otherwise: For if it were not, the reputation of innocent persons were still exposed to the insolency of the malicious.*] *pag.* 142. 143, 144. Many other are of the same mind, in so much that Father *Lessius* saith [*It is lawful, by the consent of all Casuists, to kill him that would give a box on the ear, or a blow with a stick, when a man cannot otherwise avoid it*] *pag* 145. Father *Baldellus* saith [*It is lawful to kill him that saith to you* [*thou lyest*] *if a man cannot right himself otherwise.*] And *Lessius* saith [*If you endeavour to ruine my reputation by opprobrious speeches before persons of honour, and that I cannot avoid*

avoid them otherwise than by killing you, may I do it? According to modern Authors I may; nay though the crime you lay to my charge be such as I am really guilty of, it being supposed to have been so secretly committed, that you cannot discover it by ways of justice. 'Tis proved, If when you would take away my reputation by giving me a box on the ear, it is in my power to prevent it by force of arms, the same defence is certainly lawful, when you would do me the same injury with your tongue. Besides, a man may avoid the affront of those whose ill language he cannot hinder. In a word, honour is more precious than life, but a man may kill in defence of his life, ergo, *he may kill in defence of his honour*] *pag.* 146. But the Jansenists are against all this.

Escobar saith, that [*regularly it is lawful to kill a man for the value of a crown, according to* Molina. *pag.* 151.] Father *Amicus* saith [*It is lawful for a Churchman, or a Religious man to kill a detractor that threatens to divulge the scandalous crimes of his community or himself, when there is no other means left to hinder him from doing it, as if he be ready to scatter his calumnies, if not suddenly dispatched out of the way*] *pag.* 152, 153. And *Caramovel* in his Fundamental Theologie takes it for certain, and thence concludes, that [*a Priest not only may kill a detractor on certain occasions, but sometimes ought to do it*] and yet the peevish Jansenist believeth none of this.

But I must stop: you may read in the said Jansenians Mysterie of Jesuitism, a volume of such passages of the Jesuites, allowing men to give and receive the Sacrament when they come that day from Adultery, and allowing a man to eat and drink as much as he can with his health: and discharging men from a Necessity of Loving God, unless it be once in their lives, or as

others

others say, upon Holy-days, or as *Hurtado de Mendoza*, once a year, or as *Conink*, once in three or four years, or as *Henriquez*, once in five years, or as Anthon. Sirmond, *not at all, so we do not hate him, and do obey his other commands*, with abundance more.

Now Reader I would here leave it to thy consideration, whether all these differences among the Papists are so small as to be no matters of faith. And I intreat you to read over the forementioned Book, (the Mysterie of Jesuitism) and then judge whether Papists or the Reformed Catholicks are more at unity among themselves.

Well! but suppose the loving of God, the avoiding murder, bribery, and the like, be no matter of faith at *Rome*, yet I have not done with them so. I desire to know *whether the holy Scripture be matter of faith or not?* They dare not deny but it is. Well! and what is the Scripture, but the words *ut signa*, and the sense or matter *ut res significata?* And are the Papists agreed among themselves about either of these? no: For the words, its well known how some of the best Learned of them have stood for the preheminence of the Hebrew and Greek Texts: and others, and the most, for the vulgar Latine. And that vulgar Latine Translation hath been altered and altered again by them. And after many others comes Pope *Sixtus* the fifth, and makes it so compleat, that the Church is required to use his Edition; yet after him comes Pope *Clement* the eighth and mends it in many hundred, if not thousand places, and imposes this upon the Church; Which of these Popes was Infallible? I am sure they much differ in their Translations.

And for the *sense* of Scripture, though men must swear

ſwear to take Scripture in the Churches ſenſe, yet will not any Pope or Council to this day, tell us the ſenſe of them, either by giving us an infallible Commentary, or by deciding the many thouſand differences that are among their Commentators. Do not all theſe Commentators forſwear themſelves, having ſworn (thoſe that lived ſince the Council of Trent) to expound Scripture in the ſence of the Church, and only according to the unanimous conſent of the Fathers? And why doth not the Pope decide theſe controverſies? ſeeing it is their happineſs to have ſuch a Judge of Controverſies to keep them all of a mind?

But perhaps they will ſay, *that all theſe Scriptures be not matters of faith.* No! where are we then? what is matter of faith if Scripture be not? And if *all* be not, how ſhall we know *which* is? But at leaſt, tell us, Is no one of all thoſe many hundred or thouſand Texts which your Commentators differ about any matter of Faith? If not, then ſure you have no Faith. If it be, then ſurely the Papiſts differ among themſelves in matters of Faith. It is not a few Texts that *Lyra*'s excepter and *Burgenſis* differ about, to name no more. And of the foreſaid Editions of the Bible by Pope *Sixtus*, and *Clement*, ſee Dr. *Jame's Bellum Papale*; *vel Concordia diſcors.*

CHAP. XVI.

Detect. 7. BY what hath been ſaid, you may *diſcern how to deal with them, when they would induſtriouſly confound the Eſſentials and the Integral parts of our Faith*: for this is another of their juglings.

They cannot endure to hear us distinguish the *fundamentals* (that is, the *Essentials*) of our Religion from the rest: and therefore they call out to us for a Catalogue of our fundamentals; and would perswade us that whatsoever is matter of faith, is of Necessity to salvation to be believed, and those are damnable Hereticks that deny them, and therefore we must not make any such difference. See *Knot* against *Chillingworth*. Their design in this is to perswade people that the world must be wholly of their mind in matters of faith, or else they cannot be saved. And by this trick they would prove that the Protestants and many other Churches are all Hereticks, and therefore have no place in General Councils, and are no parts of the Catholick Church. But let us consider how judiciously they proceed.

1. We must desire the Papists to tell us whether Christianity be any thing or nothing? If any thing, it hath its Essence: and 2. Whether this Essence of Christianity be Knowable or not? If not, then they cannot know a Christian from another: and they cannot know the Church from other Societies. If it be knowable, then its Essence must needs be knowable. 3. And we would be informed by them, whether all true Christians in the world are of the same stature or degree of knowledge and explicite belief? If they be, then there's no difference between Fathers and Babes, Strong and Weak, Priest and People; and then the Jesuits have no more Knowledge or Faith than the simplest woman of their Church: but if there be a difference, then 4. We would know whether the Essence of Christianity be varied according to these degrees. If so, then there are as many sorts of Christianity in the world, as there be degrees of Faith; which they have more wit, I suppose, than to affirm. If not, then the Essence of Christianity is distin-

distinguishable from the Integrity or superadded Degrees; which is the thing that we contend for. 5. We desire also to know whether the Apostles did not go on to teach their people more, after they had made them Christians, in a state of salvation. And whether the Priests, Fryers, and Jesuits will give men up, and teach them nothing more when they have made them Christians. I know they will say, There's more to be taught. And if so, then the Essentials of Christianity are distinguishable from the Integrals or Degrees. 6. And we would know else how they will understand that in *Heb.* 5. 10, 11, 12, 14. and 6. 1, 2. [*For when for the time ye ought to be Teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the Oracles of God, and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For every one that useth milk is unskilful in the word of righteousness, for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern good and evil: therefore leaving the Principles of the Doctrine of Christ, let us go on to perfection, not laying again the foundation*, &c.] Tell us now whether the Apostle do not here distinguish between babes and strong men; milk and strong meat; the principles or foundation and perfection? 7. And we would know of them whether all that is Revealed by God be of absolute Necessity to every mans salvation that do or may hear it? If so, then no man can be saved that knoweth not all that God hath revealed; and then no one in the world can be saved: for here we know but in part. And their own Commentators differ about the word of God, which sheweth that they are imperfect in the Knowledge of its sense. And their Pope knows it not, or else he is shamefully to blame, that will not tell it the world, and reconcile his Commentators and Disputers. But if

all revealed be not of Absolute Necessity, then we may have leave to distinguish between points absolutely Necessary, and the rest. 8. And we would know whether all shall be damned, that know not as much as the most Learned and Wise? If not, then still we may have leave to distinguish. 9. Further we demand, whether any ignorance or error that is culpable, will stand with Charity and Salvation? If not, then who shall be saved? If yea; then we may still distinguish the points of Absolute Necessity from the rest. 10. We demand also, whether the whole holy Scripture be the word of God? If so, then whether we ought not to believe it all as far as we can understand it? And if so, whether it be not all *de fide*, matter of Faith? If not, they must tell us, what part of Gods word is to be believed, and what not. If yea; then certainly men may err *de fide* in points of Faith, and yet have Charity, and be saved: as their disagreeing Commentators, Casuists and Schoolmen do. 11. We would know whether the matters that their Divines are disagreed in, be Revealed by God, or things unrevealed? If not revealed, do they not deserve to be kickt out of the world, for troubling the world so with unrevealed things? If they be Revealed, are they not Revealed to be believed, and so are *de fide?* 12. And we would know whether there be not some things *Essential to true Obedience*, and some things not Essential? If not, then no sinner hath sincere Obedience, and can be saved: If yea; then why may not the same be said of faith? 13. Also we would know, when they baptize the Adult, whether they require any profession of the faith from them or not? If not, they may as well baptize Infidels or Heathens. If they do, then what is that profession? Is it a profession of every particular truth that God hath revealed to be believed? No sure: for then none but Doctors must be baptized.

Nor

Nor they neither. Or is it a profeſſion of ſome particular Truths only? If of ſome only, why of thoſe more than the reſt, if they be not the Eſſentials diſtinguiſhable from the reſt? And do they make men true Chriſtians by baptizing them, or not? If they do, then ſure the Baptiſmal faith muſt contain all that is Eſſential to Chriſtianity. 14. We deſire alſo to be informed by them, what is the uſe of the Churches Creed, and why they have uſed frequently to make confeſſion of their faith? Was it not the whole faith Eſſential to Chriſtianity which they confeſt? If not, then it was not fit to be the badge of the Church; or of the Orthodox: if yea; then it ſeems thoſe Creeds had in them the Eſſentials diſtinguiſhed from the reſt. 15. we would know whether every thing delivered or defined by any General Council, be of ſuch neceſſity to ſalvation, that all, muſt explicitely believe them all, that will be ſaved? If ſo, then whether any Papiſt can be ſaved, ſeeing they underſtand them not all? If not, then ſure a diſtinction muſt be made. 16. And we would know how they can countenance ignorance ſo much as they do, if all things revealed be of equal neceſſity to ſalvation. 17. And what mean they to diſtinguiſh of Implicite and Explicite faith? Is it enough to believe as the Church believes, and not know what in any particular? then it is not *de fide*, or neceſſary to ſalvation to believe the reſurrection of Chriſt, or of man, or the life to come. For a man may believe that the Church is in the right, and yet not know that it holdeth any of theſe. Is it enough to believe the formal object of faith (which with us is Gods veracity) without the material? Or is it enough to remain Infidels, and only believe that the Church are true Believers? If you hold to this, you make no act of faith, but one (*the believing that the Church, that is, the Pope or Council are true believers*)

to be of Neceſſity to ſalvation. But if there be ſomething that is Neceſſary to be *actually* (that is explicitely) *believed*, then muſt not that be diſtinguiſhed from the reſt and made known? 18. Whence is it that you denominate men *fideles*; *believers* with you? Is it from a Poſitive faith, or for *not holding the contrary?* If the *latter*, then Stones, and Beaſts, and Pagans, and their Infants may be believers. If the *former*, then that Poſitive faith from whence all believers are denominated muſt be known. 19. Is not that true faith and all that is Eſſential to Chriſtianity, which doth conſiſt with ſaving grace or (to uſe your phraſe) with true Charity? If not, then either Infidels and no Chriſtians may have true Charity, or elſe true Charity may be in the unjuſtified; or both: If yea, (which doubtleſs you will yield) then ſure men of lower knowledge and faith than Doctors, may have true Charity; and therefore true faith. 20. Laſtly, I appeal to your own confeſſions. *Bellarmine* often diſtinguiſheth between the points that all muſt of Neceſſity explicitely believe, and the reſt. And *Suarez* in 3. part. *Thom. Diſp.* 43. *Sect.* 4. faith of the Article of Chriſts deſcending into Hell [*If by an Article of faith we underſtand a truth which all the faithful are bound explicitely to know and believe, ſo I do not think it neceſſary to reckon this among the Articles of faith, becauſe it is not altogether neceſſary for all men*] Here you ſee that *Suarez* diſtinguiſheth between Articles of Neceſſity to all, and thoſe that are not: and that he excepts even the Deſcent into Hell from this number of Articles Neceſſary to all. I might cite many more of your writers; but the thing is well known.

But perhaps you'l ſay, *that though all that is* de fide, *be not neceſſary to be believed explicitely by all, yet implicitely it muſt.* I *Anſw.* 1 That which you call *Implicite*

plicite believing is no *believing that point*, *but another point*: yea a point that doth not so much as infer that: for it followeth not [*the Church is infallible*; *therefore Christ descended into Hell.*]

2. And we believe all that is *de fide* with an *Implicite faith* as well as you: But it is an *Implicite Divine faith*, and not *humane*: For we are sure that *All that God saith is true*; and this *Divine veracity* is the formal object of our faith. And we believe that all that is in Scripture is true, and that all that was ever delivered by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost is true.

Object. *But all that is* de fide *is so necessary, that it will not stand with salvation to believe the contrary, or deny or dis-believe any point of faith. Answ.* 1. That cannot be true, For no man can prove that a point may not be denyed and disputed against by a true believer as long as he is ignorant that it is true, and from God: the same ignorance that keeps him from knowing it, may cause him to deny it, and gainsay it. 2. Do not your own differing Commentators, Schoolmen and Casuists (on one side at least) dispute voluminously against some Truths of Divine revelation? If you change a mans mind from the smallest error by dispute, do you take that to be a change of his state from death to life? *Æneas Sylvius* thought a General Council was above the Pope: but when he came to be Pope *Pius* the second, he thought the Pope above a General Council; was this a change from death to life? It seems by his Bull of Retractation, he thought so, but so did not several General Councils. Was the Catholick Church Representative at the Council of *Basil*, or *Constance*, or *Pisa* in a state of death and damnation for believing the Pope to be subject to a General Council? or was the Council at *Laterane* (another Representative Ca-

tholick Church) in a ſtate of death for holding the Contrary? Muſt either Pope *John* the twenty ſecond, or Pope *Nicolas* be damned becauſe of the contrariety of their Decrees? If the Council of *Tolet.* the firſt ordain *that he that hath a Concubine inſtead of a wife, ſhall not be kept from the Sacrament*, doth it prove them all in a ſtate of death? If *Bellarmine* confeſs that the ſixth General Council at *Conſtantinople* have many errors, doth it follow that the Catholick Church repreſentative was in a damnable ſtate? If the ſecond Council at *Nice* maintain the *corporeity of Angels*, and the firſt Council at the *Laterane* maintain the *contrary*, doth it follow that one of them was in a ſtate of death? I think not: (though I am ſure it proves a General Council fallible, when approved by the Pope, and therefore Popery a deceit.) *Bellarmine* ſometime tells us of the change of his own mind.

And the Retractations of *Auſtin* (a better man) tell us of the change of his mind in many things: And yet it followeth not that he was in a ſtate of death and unjuſtified before.

Object. *But all that is* de fide *is of Neceſſity to the Salvation of ſome, though not of all.* *Anſw.* 1. If that be granted, yet you muſt grant us leave to diſtinguiſh between Points neceſſary to be believed by all, and points that are not thus neceſſary to all. 2. But in what caſe is it that you mean, that other points are of Neceſſity to ſome? 1. Is it to thoſe ſome that know them to be of Divine Revelation? We eaſily grant you that: But that is not becauſe the *Things* themſelves are ſimply neceſſary to Salvation; but becauſe a *Belief of Gods veracity*, and the Truth of all that he Revealeth in general, is of neceſſity: and he that Believeth that God is True (*verax*) cannot chuſe but believe *all to be True* which he knows God revealeth. He that thinketh God

God to be a Lyar, in one word, doth not believe *his veracity*, and so hath no Divine faith at all. And therefore you need not fear lest any one should be guilty of not believing that which they know is the word of God, but those that take God to be a Lyar, and that is those that take him not to be God, and so are Atheists. But still the thing of Absolute necessity is but first to believe in General that God is true in all his word, secondly and to believe the truth of the Essential points of Christianity in particular (embracing the Good propounded in them.) Now its true that secondarily all known Truths are of necessity to be believed, because else our General belief of Gods veracity is not sincere. But yet we must say that antecedently even to that person, these superadded truths were not of Necessity to his Salvation to be believed, because they were not of such Necessity to be *Known*; and if they had not been known, you would say your selves there had not been such Necessity of Believing them.

But if you go further, and say, that *all that were obliged to know them, or that had opportunity, or the Revelation of the truth, and yet did not, and thereupon deny them culpably, are in a state of death*; I deny that, and shall prove it false. Its true, that a *wilful* refusing the *Light*, because men *love darkness rather than light*, is a certain sign of a graceless wretch. But *every culpable ignorance* and unbelief is not Damning ignorance or unbelief.

1. Otherwise no man should be saved: For no man is void of culpable ignorance, and consequently of culpable unbelief. Had we never been wanting in the use of means, there's no man but might have known more than he doth. Is there any one of you that dare refuse to ask God forgiveness of your ignorance, unbelief, or the negligence that is the culpable cause of them,

them, or that dare say, you need no pardon of them? 2. If you plead for venial sin, how can you deny a venial unbelief upon venial ignorance? But then I pray you learn more wit and piety, 1. than to say that your venial unbelief or sin is no sin, save as Analogically so called; or 2. than to say it deserves a pardon, or deserves not everlasting punishment. But if you will call it *venial*, because being consistent with the true Love of God and habitual Holiness, and saving faith, the Law of Grace doth pardon it, and not condemn men for it, thus we would agree with you that there is *venial sin*; but then you must yield us that there is venial unbelief.

3. And we easily prove all this from the Law of God. It is the nature of the preceptive part to constitute Duty only, and the violation of that is sin: But it is the Sanction, the promise and threatning that Determines of the Reward and Penalty: Now it is only the old Law of works that makes the Threatening as large as the prohibition, condemning man for every sin: but so doth not the Law of Grace. The precept still commandeth Perfect obedience, and so makes it a duty; but the promise maketh not perfect obedience the condition of Salvation; but Faith, Repentance and sincere Obedience, though imperfect. The Law of Nature still makes everlasting Death due to every sin: But it is such a Due as hath a Remedy at hand provided and offered in the Gospel; and is actually remedied to all true believers. So that as it is not every sin that will damn us, though damnation be due to it, (because we have a present Remedy;) so it is not every culpable ignorance or unbelief that will damn us, though it deserve damnation, because the Gospel doth not only not damn us for it, but pardons it, by acquitting us from the condemnation of the Law. All this may teach you, not only to mend your

your abominable Doctrine about Mortal and venial sin, but also to discern the reason why a man may deny some points of faith that are not of the essence of Christianity, and yet not be damned for it, because the Law of Grace doth not condemn him for it, though he be culpable, because the Law of Grace may command further than it peremptorily condemneth in case of disobedience. It is the *Promise* that makes faith the *Condition of Life*, though it be the *Precept* that makes it a *duty*: Now it saveth not as a *performed Duty* directly, (because the precept gives not the Reward) but as a *performed Condition*: And therefore unbelief condemneth not effectually as a meer sin directly, but as *such a sin* as is the violation or non-performance of that condition. But it is not a belief of every thing that is preceptively *de fide*, which is made the condition of life.

CHAP. XVII.

Detect. 8. ANother of their Juglings is, *to extoll the judgement of the Catholick Church as that which must be the ground of faith, and the decider of all Controversies*: And to this end they plead against the sufficiency of Scripture, and bend all the force of their arguings and designs, as if all their hope lay in this point, and as if it were a granted thing that the day is theirs, and we are lost, if the Catholick Church be admitted to be the Judge. Hence it is that they cry out against private faith and opinions, and call men to the faith of the Church, and perswade the poor people, that the Church is for them, and we are but branches broken off.

Well, we are content to deal with them at their own weapon, and at that one in which they put their trust.

For

For our parts we know that the true Catholick Church (nor any member of it, *in ſenſu Compoſito*) cannot err in any of the *Eſſentials* of Chriſtianity (for then it would ceaſe to be the Church:) But we have too much reaſon to Judge that it is not free from error in leſſer things. But yet for all that in the main cauſe between the Papiſts and us, we refuſe not their judgement. Nay we turn this Canon againſt the Canoneers, and eaſily prove that the Papiſts cauſe is utterly loſt, if the Catholick Church be Judge.

But is it the Ancient Church, or the preſent Church that muſt decide the cauſe? Well! It ſhall be which you will. For the moſt Ancient Church in the Apoſtles days, we are altogether of its belief, and ſtand to its deciſion in all things; and if you prove we miſtake them in any thing, we ſhall gladly receive inſtruction and be reclaimed. To them we appeal for our Eſſentials and Integrals. And for ſome following ages, we will be tryed by them in the Articles of our Faith, and in the principal Controverſies we have with the Papiſts.

Yea, but this will not ſerve their turn: It is the preſent Church that muſt judge or none: For ſay they, *if the ancient Church had power, ſo hath the preſent: and if the ancient Church had poſſeſſion of the truth, how ſhall we know it but by the preſent?* I anſwer, 1. We may know it by the Records of thoſe times far ſurer than by the reports of men without writing: Controverſies or numerous myſterious points are ſorrily carried in the memories, eſpecially of the moſt, even of the Teachers; Eſpecially when mens memories die with them, and they cannot make their Children the heirs of their knowledge or memories: Do you now remember what was done in the days of *Ignatius*, *Juſtin*, *Cyprian*, &c. that never ſaw them? And can you, that hardly teach your Children a long Catechiſm,

techiſm, teach them to carry in memory all your voluminous Councils better than written Records can preſerve them. And for the Records, one diligent skilful man will know more than ten thouſand others. One *Baronius*, *Albaſpinæus*, *Petavius*, among the Papiſts, and one *Uſher*, *Blondell*, *Salmaſius*, *Gataker*, &c. among the Proteſtants, knew more of the mind of antiquity, than a whole Country beſides, or perhaps than ſome General Councils have known.

2. Well! but if you appeal to the greater number, to them ſhall you go. You muſt be tried by the preſent Church; Why then you are condemned. Is it the leſſer number, or the greater, or the better that muſt be judge? You will not ſay the leſſer, as ſuch: If you do, you know where you are. If you ſay, the better part ſhall be judge: who ſhall be Judge which is the better part? We are ready to prove the Reformed Churches the better part: and if we do not, we will give you the day, and loſe our cauſe. But I ſuppoſe you will appeal to the greater part. Content! Then the world knows you are loſt. The Greeks, Moſcovites, Armenians, Abaſſines, and all other Churches in *Aſia*, *Africa* and *Europe* are far more than the Papiſts: and your own pens and mouths tell us that theſe are againſt you. Many of them curſe you as Hereticks or Schiſmaticks; the reſt of them know you not, or refuſe your government. They all agree againſt your Popes univerſal Headſhip or Soveraignty, and ſo againſt the very form of your new Catholick Church: So that the world knows the Judgement of the far greateſt part of Chriſtians on earth to be againſt you in the main: So that you ſee what you get by appealing to the Catholick Church.

But I know you will ſay, that all theſe are Schiſmaticks, or Hereticks, and none of the Catholick Church:

But

But they ſay as much by you, ſome of them, and all of them abhor your charge; and how do you prove it? and who ſhall be Judge whether they, or you be the Catholick Church? You tell us of your ſucceſſion, and twenty tales that are good, if you may be Judges your ſelves; but ſo do they ſay as much which is good if they be Judges. When we offer to diſpute our caſe with you, you ask us *Who ſhall be Judge*, and tell us *the Catholick Church muſt be Judge*: But who ſhall be Judge between you and them which is the Catholick Church? You will not let us be Judges in our own cauſe, and why then ſhould you? Are we Proteſtants the *leſſer number* as to you? ſo are you to all the reſt that are againſt you. And what reaſon have we to let the *leſſer number* Judge over the *Greater*? If ſtill you ſay, becauſe you are the *Better*, let that be firſt tryed; but no reaſon you ſhould there alſo be the Judges.

So that the caſe is plainly come to this, *Either the Papiſts muſt ſtand to the Greater number*, and then the Controverſie is at end: or they muſt ſhamefully ſay, *We will not diſpute with you, unleſs we may be the Judges our ſelves, though the fewer.* Or elſe they muſt lay by their talk of a Judge, and diſpute it equally with us, by producing their evidence, which we are ever ready for.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVIII.

Detect. 9 THE moſt common and prevalent Deceit of the Papiſts is, *by ambiguous terms to deceive thoſe that cannot force them to diſtinguiſh, and to make you believe they mean one thing, when they mean another, and to mock you with cloudy words.* I ſhall here warn you to look to them therefore eſpecially in three terms, on which much of their Controverſies lies, that is, the words *Church*, *Pope*, *and Council.* For there's but few underſtand what they mean by any one of theſe words.

1. When you come to diſpute of the Church with them, ſee that you agree firſt under your hands of the Definition of that Church of which you diſpute. And when you call them to Define it, you will find them in a wood, you will little think how many ſeveral things it is that they call [*the Church*:] For example, Sometime they mean *the whole Body, Paſtors and People:* but more commonly they mean *only the Paſtors*, which are the far ſmalleſt part. And ſometime they mean the *Church Real:* and ſometimes only the Church *Repreſentative*, as they call it, in a General Council. But whethey they mean the Paſtors or People, they exclude all ſaving the Pope and his ſubjects, and ſo by the [*Church*] mean but a *part or ſect.* Sometime in the Queſtion about *Tradition*, ſome of the French take the [*Church*] for the *community*, (as fathers deliver the Doctrine of Chriſt to their Children, *&c.*) And ſometime they take it in its *Political* ſence, for a holy ſociety, conſiſting of a *viſible Head and members:* But then they agree not of that Head, ſome ſetting the *Pope higheſt*, and ſome the *Council.* But frequently they take the word

word [*Church*] for the ſuppoſed *Head alone*, as in moſt queſtions about Infallibility, Judging of Controverſies, expounding Scripture, keeping of Traditions, defining points of faith, *&c.* They ſay, *The Church muſt do theſe:* but commonly they mean the *ſuppoſed Head:* And one part mean a *General Council:* and the Jeſuites and Italians, and predominant part do mean *only the Pope.* So that when they talk of the *whole Catholick Church*, and call you to its Judgement, and boaſt of its Infallibility (you would little think it) they mean all this while but *one poor ſinful man:* and ſuch a man as ſometime hath been more unlearned than many of your ſchool-boys of twelve or fourteen years of age; and ſometime hath been a Murtherer, Adulterer, and (if General Councils, or the common vote may be believed) an Heretick, an Infidel, an Incarnate Devil. This man is their Church, as *Gretſer*, *Bellarmine*, and the reſt of that ſtrain profeſs.

So that if you do but force them to define and explain what they mean by the Church, you will either cauſe them to open their nakedneſs, or find them all to pieces about the very ſubject of the Diſpute.

2. So alſo when they uſe the name of [*a Pope*] in diſputation, make them explain themſelves, and tell you (*in a Definition*) what they mean by [*a Pope.*] For, though you would think this term were ſufficiently underſtood, yet you ſhall find them utterly at a loſs, and all to pieces about it. Let us conſider diſtinctly of the Efficient, Matter, and Form. 1. As to the efficient cauſe of their Pope, there muſt concur a *Divine Inſtitution* (which they can no where ſhew,) and a *call from man* (*& Nemo dat quod non habet*, What man or men have power to make a Head to the Catholick Church?) But whether they will call it an *Efficient Cauſe*, or only a *Cauſa ſine qua non*, *Election* and

and *Ordination* must go to make a Pope. Now either they *will* put these into their *Definition*, or not. If *not*, know of them *whether a man without Election and Ordination may be Pope:* If so, what *makes him one?* If *Possession*, then he that can conquer *Rome*, and sit down in the chair is Pope: If *not possession*, what then? and why may not any man say, I am Pope? Well: but doubtless they will tell you that *Election*, or *Ordination*, or both, is Necessary. If so, then first for *Election*, is it Necessary to the being of a Pope, that *some certain persons Elect* who have the Power, or will *any Electors* serve whosoever? If *any* will serve, then every Monastery or every Parish may choose a Pope? If there must be certain Authorized Electors, see that those be named in the Definition: or at least declared. And then first know whether these *Electors* are *impowered* to that work by *Divine Law*, *or by Humane:* If by Divine, let them shew it if they can. In Scripture they can never find who must choose the Pope. And their *Tradition* (if that were a Divine law) hath no such precept, as appeareth by the alterations and divers ways. And if it be but by a *Humane Ecclesiastical* Canon, then it seems the *Papacy* is so too: for the Power received can have no higher a cause than the Power giving or authorizing.

2. When you come to know who these Electors must be, you open their nakedness. For first if they say, It must be the *Cardinals*, ask them, where then was the Pope when there were no *Cardinals* in the world? and whether that were a Pope or not that was chosen by the whole *Romane Clergie?* or whether those were Popes or not that were chosen by the *People?* or those that were chosen by the *Emperours?* or those that were chosen by *Councils?* If they tell you that it must be the *Romane Clergie*; Know whether the Cardinals be the

whole *Roman Clergie*, who are Biſhops of other Churches, or whether they are not meerly Titular, at leaſt many of them? And whether the People, the Council, or the Emperours were the *Romane Clergie?* If they would perſwade you, that either the People, or the Emperour, or Council did not elect the Pope, but only ſhew whom the Romane Clergy ſhould elect, interpoſing exorbitantly ſome unjuſt force with the Due Election, then all currant Hiſtory cryeth ſhame againſt them, and we will lay the Diſpute on that with them readily, though it were with *Baronius* himſelf. Nothing almoſt is more evident in the Papal Hiſtory, than that there have been at leaſt theſe five ways of election among them. Let them put it upon this iſſue with us when they will.

If they allow of any of theſe as valid, which ever it be (as they muſt, or give up their ſucceſſion) then 1. We would know by what Law of God the Emperour of *Germany* may chooſe a Head for the Catholick Church, any more than the Emperour of *Habaſſia*, or the King of *France* or *Spain?* 2. And we would know when the Emperour hath choſen one, and the Clergy another (if not ſome others a third) whether both were not true Popes, if both parties were authorized Electors? And if yet the People chooſe one, and the Romane Clergy another, and the Cardinals alone a third, and the Emperour a fourth, and the Council a fifth, muſt all theſe ſtand, or which of them, and why? Or if they tell you that it muſt be the particular Roman Church; then 1. If the people of that Church chooſe one, and the Clergy by Major vote another, and the Cardinals a third, which is the true Pope? 2. And then the ſucceſſion is gone however: For they were no Popes that Emperours or Councils choſe.

2. If they ſhall tell you that it is not Election but Con-

Conſecration that makes a Pope, yea or that Conſecration is of Neceſſity with Election; then 1. Demand of them *whether it be any one whoſoever that may Conſecrate*, or *whether this high power be confined to certain hands?* If *any* may ſerve, or *any* Biſhops, then he that can get three drunken Biſhops to conſecrate him may be Pope. And then there may be an hundred Popes at once. But if it be confined to certain hands, 2. Let it be put down in the Definition, or at leaſt declared who thoſe are that muſt ordain or conſecrate him. 3. And if they ſay, that *It muſt be only the Italian Biſhops that muſt conſecrate*, then 1. Know of them by what Law of God they have power to conſecrate a Head to the Univerſal Church, when all nations are agreed that *quod pertinet ad omnes, ab omnibus tractari debet.* 2. And by what Law they can Create or Generate a creature of a more noble ſpecies than themſelves, as if a beaſt ſhould beget a man? Or whether this prove not, that as a *Biſhop* at firſt was but *Presbyter primæ ſedis*, (like the fore-man of a Jury) and thence ſprung an *Archbiſhop*, who was *Epiſcopus primæ ſedis*, and thence a *Patriarck*, who was *Archiepiſcopus primæ ſedis*; ſo in proceſs of time, when pride grew riper, the *Pope* grew to be *Patriarcha primæ ſedis*; but not till long after, the *Head or Governour of the Univerſal Church*, nor *Patriarcha Patriarcharum*; no more than the *Archbiſhops* or *Biſhops* were at firſt *Epiſcopi Epiſcoporum.*

But if they can ſhew us no law of God empowring theſe ſpecial Conſecrators, any more than others, then where is the *Papacy* that dependeth on it? There is nothing in Scripture to empower the *Italian* Biſhops any more than the *Gallicane*, *Germane*, or *Aſian*, to Conſecrate a Head for the Catholick Church.

3. But ſuppoſe there were, yet we muſt be reſolved

whether it be *some* or *all* the *Italian* Bishops that must do it? If but some, which be they? and how is their power proved? If all or any, then 1. What shall we do when some of them consecrate one Pope, and some another, and some a third, which hath fallen out: Which of these is the Pope? If Consecration give the Power, then all are Popes. 2. And still the Papal succession is overthrown, while many Popes had no Consecration by *Italian* Bishops.

Thus you may see what a case the poor Jesuits or Fryars will be in, if you put them but to insert the necessary Electors and Consecrators in their Definition of a Pope.

2. But that's not the worst, you must require them *to put his necessary Qualification in the Description.* For if no *Disposition of the Matter* be necessary, but *ex quolibet ligno fit mercurius Romanus*, then a Jew or other Infidel may be Pope: which they will deny. And if any *Disposition of the subject* be of necessity to the Reception of the form, then cause them to put it down. And then 1. It is either *true Godlineß:* and then farewell Papacy. 2. Or it is *common honesty and sobriety:* and then still farewel Papacy. 3. Or it is *learning and knowledge:* and then *Alphonsus à Castro*, and others of their own will bear witness that some Popes understood not their Grammar, and one good man being (saith *Wernerus*) *rudis literarum*, was fain to get another Compope to say his offices, (though it happened that they could not agree, and so a third was chosen, and his choice disliked, and a fourth chosen, till there was six chosen Popes alive at once.) 4. If *age* be necessary, then the Children Popes (one at least) have interrupted the succession. 5. Yea, if the Masculine Gender be but Necessary, Pope *Joan* hath interrupted the succession, unless between forty or fifty of their own Historians de-

ceiv

ceive us; (which its possible I confess they may have done, as I am inclined to believe, since I read *Dav. Blondel de Joh. Papissa*, that impartial and most incomparable antiquary and Historian). 6. But all this is the smallest part, the Question is *whether faith in Christ be of Necessity to a Pope?* If so, then what will you say to *John* the twenty third, that denyed *the life to come*, and to those that have been guilty of *Heresie?* So that by that time they have put the necessary Qualification of a Pope into their Definition, you shall find them hard put to it.

3. But yet the worst is behind. They be not agreed about the very *form of the Papacy*: For some say, *He is the Head of all the Catholick Church*: But others with the General Councils of *Constance* and *Basil* say, that *he is the Head only of the singular members*, but a *subject to the Catholick Church represented in a Council*, which receiveth its power immediately from Christ. So that you may see what a case they will be in, if they be but forced to tell you what they mean by a *Pope*, and to Define him.

3. And if they use the name of *a General Council*, call them to *Define* what they mean by a *General Council*: Some of them will say, *It must be a true Representative of the whole Catholick Church*: so that *Morally* they are all Consenting to what is there done. But then the doubt remaineth, whether there be a Necessity of any certain Number of Bishops? If not; it seems the whole Church may agree that twenty, or ten, or two, or one shall represent them, and be a general Council. But if this must not hold, then *Must all the Bishops of the world be there, or only some*, and *how many?* Binnius saith, Vol. 1. pag. 313. that [*a General Council is that where all the Bishops of the whole world may and ought to be present, unless they be lawfully hindred, and in*

which none but the Pope of Rome *by himself or his Legates, is wont to preside.*] And vol. 3. pag. 229. [*It is when all the Church is morally Represented, the Pope presiding.*] But what a loss are we here at?

1. How prove they that only *Bishops* should be members of a Council, and not *Presbyters?*

2. But suppose they help you over this rub, yet by their Definition they null many General Councils, because the Pope presided not there: even the first General Council it self at *Nice* (whatsoever they boldly feign to the contrary.)

3. And by this Rule, either we never had a General Council, or but few: For instance, At the first Session of the Council of *Trent* (the last and most famous Council) there were but four Archbishops, and twenty two Bishops, taking in the Titular Bishops of *Upsal*, *Armach*, and *Worcester*. And at divers other Sessions after, but eight, or nine, or very few more. In the fourth Session which Decreed to receive Tradition with equal pious affection and reverence as the holy Scriptures, and which gave us a false Catalogue of the Canonical Books, there were but the Popes Legates, two Cardinals, nine Archbishops (titular and all) and forty one, or forty two Bishops (titular and all.) Now we would fain know whether this was the whole Church morally represented? and whether these twenty two, or forty one were all the Bishops of the world, or the hundreth part of them? Yea whether all the Bishops of the *African*, *Asian*, and other Churches could and ought to have been there?

If they say that most of the Bishops of the world are Hereticks or Schismaticks, and had nothing to do to be there, we are sure that this is but the impudent censure of a Sect, that unchurcheth most of Christs Church, for

for far leſs faults than it ſelf is guilty of: But how is this heavy cenſure proved?

4. Nay to make ſhort of it, its plain by this Definition, that a *General Council* is but a *name* (at leaſt ſince the days when the Church lay in a narrow room), and that no ſuch thing is to be expected in the world. For 1. If all Biſhops, or half come thither, what ſhall their poor flocks do the while? 2. How many years muſt they be travelling from *America*, *Ethiopia*, and all the remote parts of the Chriſtian world? 3. So much ſhipping, and proviſion, and ſo many thouſand pound a man is neceſſary for the Convoy of many, that alas the poor Biſhops be not able to defray the hundreth part of the charge. 4. Abundance of them are ſo aged and weak, that they are unfit for the journey. 5. Their Princes are ſome of them Infidels, and ſome at wars, and will never give them leave to come. 6. They muſt paſs through many Kingdoms of the enemies, or that are in wars, that will never ſuffer them to paſs. 7. The tediouſneſs, and hazards of the journey, with change of air is like to be the death of moſt of them, and ſo its but a plot to put an end to the Church. 8. The length of General Councils is ſuch (ſome of them being ten years, and ſome (as that at *Trent*) eighteen years) that ſo many Biſhops to be ſo long abſent from home, is but to give up the Church to Infidelity or Impiety (unleſs the Biſhops be ſuch things as the Church can ſpare.) 9. When they come together, they cannot many of them underſtand one another, becauſe of the diverſity of their languages. 10. And the number would be ſo great, that ten or twenty Council-houſes or rooms would not hold them: ſo that they could not Converſe in one Aſſembly: ſo that a true General Council now, is but a name to amuſe thoſe that think the

world is no bigger than a man may ride over in a weeks journey.

5. And yet even this Definition of *Binnius* is ridiculous: For he makes it enough that all the Bishops of the world *may* and *ought* to be there, whether they be there or not. But then what if lazineſs or danger deterr them or detain them? Is that a Council where Biſhops *ought to be* and *are not?* How many muſt *de facto* be preſent, *any or none?* Prove if you can that forty Biſhops are a General Council, becauſe the reſt *ought* to be there. And who ſhall be judge of each mans caſe, whether he *could* or *ought* to have been there? Will you judge men before they are heard, or their cauſe known? Your ſaying that they *ought to have been there*, is no proof.

And yet *Binnius* hath one exception [*unleſs lawfully hindred*]. Good ſtill! If all the Biſhops in the world be *lawfully hindered*, it ſeems it is a General Council when no body is there: You ſee now what you put the poor Papiſts too, if you put them to *define* a *General Council*, or tell you what they mean by that word.

And therefore I again adviſe you, let them not befool you with empty or ambiguous words. And when they are all to pieces among themſelves, let them not make you believe they are united by agreeing in *One word*, when they are ſeveral things that are meant by that one word.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIX.

Deceit. 10. When they go about from Councils or other History to prove the Soveraignty of the Pope, let them not *cheat you by confounding*, 1. *An humane Ordinance with a Divine:* 2. *And an alterable point of Order with an unalterable essential part of the Church:* 3. *Or a meer Primacy in the same Order or office, with a Governing Soveraignty or a different Order or Office.*

First therefore we would learn of them, whether the preheminence and order of the five *Patriarchal* Sees, began not about the first General Gouncil to be lookt after, but was setled some while after: For till there were General Councils (such as were so called) there was no great occasion of determining which should have the first, second, or third seat.

2. Or when ever the time was, yet we enquire, whether these other Sees as of *Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria*, or some of them were not *Patriarchal* as soon as *Rome?* and whether Councils that speak of priority or posteriority, do not in the same manner, and on the same grounds, and to the same ends give *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, their places, as they give to *Rome* the first place? Surely we find them speaking of them as matters of the same Order and nature; saying, *Rome* shall have the first place or seat, *Constantinople* the second, *Alexandria* the third, *Antioch* the fourth, and *Jerusalem* the fifth. 3. And therefore we enquire *whether all these have not the same kind of right to their preheminence, whether it be Divine or Humane?* And that the very foundation of this Patriarchal order, yea of *Romes* Patriarchal Primacy, (which was the preparative

rative to its universal Soveraignty) was a meer humane invention, given on occasion of the Imperial seat at *Rome*, and not any institution of Christ to *Peter* and his Successors, I desire you not to take from my word; but all that will not be fool'd out of all Historical verity by Popish audacity, let them take it from the expres words of the fourth great approved General Council, *viz.* of *Calcedon*, which the poor *Jacobites* and other Churches of the East and South are so reproached for rejecting. In *Act.* 16. *Binnii pag.* 134. these are their words [*Definitiones Sanctorum Patrum sequentes ubiq;, & Regulam, & quæ nunc relecta sunt* 150 *Deo amantissimorum Episcoporum, qui congregati sunt sub piæ memoriæ Imperatore majore Theodosio in Regia civitate Constantinop. Nova Roma, cognoscentes & nos eadem definivimus de privilegiis ejusdem Sanctissimæ Constantinop. Ecclesiæ novæ Romæ. Etenim sedi Senioris Romæ, propter Imperium civitatis illius* (N. B.) *patres consequenter privilegia reddiderunt. Et eadem intentione permoti* 150 *Deo amantissimi Episcopi æqua sanctissimæ sedi novæ Romæ privilegia tribuerunt, rationabiliter judicantes Imperio & Senatu Urbem ornatam æquis Senioris Regiæ Romæ privilegiis frui.*] i. e. [*We following alway the Definitions of the holy Fathers, and the Canon, and knowing those that now have been read of the hundred and fifty Bishops, most beloved of God, that were Congregated under the Emperour of pious memory* Theodosius *the Greater, in the Royall City* Constantinople (*new* Rome,) *have our selves also defined the same things, concerning the Priviledges of the same most holy Church of* Constantinople, *new* Rome. *For to the seat of old* Rome, *because of the Empire of that City, the Fathers consequently gave the Priviledges. And the hundred and fifty Bishops most beloved of God, being moved with the same intention, have given equal Privi-*

ledges

ledges to the moſt holy Seat of New Rome: *reaſonably judging, that the City adorned with the Empire and Senate, ſhall enjoy equal Priviledges with old Regal* Rome.]

I do not ſtand to note that this Council was called by *Martian*: that his Lay Officers were called the Judges, or how light the Council made of *Rome* when they ſaid [*Qui contradicunt Neſtoriani ſunt: qui contradicunt* Romam *ambulent*] Bin. p. 98. Nor do I ſtand ſo much on it, that they gave *Conſtantinople* equal Priviledges. But it may confound all the Papal Juglers on earth to find an approved General Council affirming, 1. That *Romes* Priviledges (even its meer primacy) were given by the Fathers. 2. And that becauſe it was the Imperial City. 3. And therefore on the ſame reaſon they do the like by *Conſtantinople*. 4. And that the General Council of *Conſtant.* had gone before them on theſe grounds: ſo that you have the vote of two of the firſt four great General Councils, that it was not ſo from the beginning, nor an Apoſtolical Tradition, but the act of the Fathers, becauſe of the Imperial City. If a General Council can err, Popery is a deceit. If it cannot err, then the very Primacy of order in the Pope was then but new, and humane, on a Carnal ground, done by man, that might do the like by others, and therefore undo this again.

But ſay they, *Pope* Leo *confirmed not this.* *Anſw.* 1. Still then the Church Repreſentative it ſeems may err, and the Pope only is infallible. 2. *Leo* and his Delegates were offended at *Anatolius* his riſing, and the equalling him with *Rome:* but they never excepted one word (that ever I found) againſt the ſaying, that *it was becauſe of the Empire that* Rome *by the Fathers had the Primacy given it.*

And the Reaſon given by themſelves *Concil. Conſtant.*

ſtant. Can. 5. is, [*becauſe* Conſtantinople *is new* Rome]. But *Binnius* ſaith that *Rome receiveth not the Canons of this Council neither, but only their condemnation of* Macedonius. And he ſaith [*that every Council hath juſt ſo much ſtrength and authority as the Apoſtolick ſeat beſtoweth on it. For* (ſaith he) *unleſs this be admitted, no reaſon can be given why ſome Councils of greater numbers of Biſhops were reprobated; and others of a ſmaller number confirmed*] Bin. Vol. 2. p. 515.

What would you have more Sirs? Do you not ſee yet what the Popiſh Catholick Church is; and what they mean when they mouth it out to you, and ask you Whether your private Judgement be ſafer or wiſer than that of the whole Church, or of all the Chriſtian world? You ſee they mean all this while but one man, whom *Gretſer* and others plainly confeſs they call the Church. So that indeed it is General Councils, and all the Chriſtian world or Church that are the ignorant, fallible, and oft erring part: and it is one man, (that ſometime is reputed an incarnate Devil by a General Council too) that is the unerring Pillar of the Church, and wiſer than all they. Do you not ſee that they make a meer nothing or mockery of General Councils, any further than they pleaſe the Pope? And can you expect that any thing ſhould pleaſe them that is againſt his Greatneſs, or, as *Julius* the ſecond calls it, [*his holding the place of the great God, the Maker of all things, and all Laws?*] What a vile abuſe is it then of the Pope to trouble the world by the meetings and Conſultations of General Councils, when he can ſit at *Rome* and contradict them infallibly, and, Good man, is fain to ſave the Catholick Church from the Errors that General Councils (the Repreſentative Catholick Church) would elſe lead them into: and therefore could he not with leſs

ado

ado infallibly make us Laws, Canons, and Scriptures without them? For sure that which the Pope can do *against* a General Council, he can do *without* them. If he can infallibly contradict a General Council, and infallibly Rule us *contrary* to their Judgement, he may no doubt infallibly Rule us without them. And therefore of late times they have learnt so much wit, that you may look long enough before you see a General Council. And I think the Council of *Constance* were no better Prognosticators than *William Lilly*, nor no more effectual Lawgivers than *Wat Tyler*, when they Prognosticated or Ordained Decennial Councils: And I will be judged by all the world.

And here also you may see what account the Papists make even of the first General Councils. Its all one with them to judge others Hereticks for contradicting especially the four first General Councils (compared to the four Evangelists) as the Scripture it self: and yet (who would have thought it) they profess themselves to reject the Canons or Decrees of both these, the first of *Constantinople*, and that of *Calcedon* in part.

And, now I think on it, by this Priviledge I cannot see but the Pope is Priviledged from all possibility of being an Heretick personally. But these things are on the by, I return to the point in hand, which is to prove to you, that not only the Romish Universal Monarchy and Vice-godhead, but even its Patriarchal Primacy was no Apostolical Tradition, but an Humane Institution, founded on this Consideration, that *Rome* was the Imperial Seat and City.

5. And Humane it must needs be. 1. For we find that Councils did not declare it as any part of the Law of God, but Ordain it as an act of their own. 2. We find them adding the Patriarchate of *Constantinople*, which was a new seat, neither Patriarch nor Bishop residing

residing there in the Apostles days, or long after. 3. Yea we find them giving this new Patriarch the second place, and once making him equal with old *Rome*, which they would never have presumed to do, if they had thought that the Patriarchship of *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, or *Rome* had been of Divine Institution: for what horrible arrogancy would that have been, when the Holy Ghost by the Apostles had made *Alexandria* second, and *Antioch* third, and *Rome* first, for a Council to set *Constantinople* before two of them, and equal with the first.

6. And therefore we have reason to think that if Patriarchs be desirable Creatures, there may more and more new ones now be made, as lawfully as *Constantinople* was.

7. And we do not think that a General Council or Pope can make a man of one Nation to be Patriarch of the Church in another Nation, that perhaps may be in wars with the Prince of the first Nation: but that each Prince with the Church under their Power, hath more to do in it than either Pope or Council. And if *Portugal* and *France* set up Patriarchs at home, they do as lawfully as the Patriarch of *Constantinople* was set up.

8. And therefore we must needs judge, that to disobey the Pope, or withdraw from his subjection (if he had never forfeited his Patriarchship by the claim of an Universal Headship) were no greater a sin, than to disobey or withdraw from the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, or *Constantinople*. Either the Government by Patriarchs and Arch-bishops is of Gods ordaining and approving, or not: If not then it is no sin to reject any of them. If it be of God, then to reject any of them (though in simple error) is a sin of disobedience through ignorance, but is far from proving a man to be no member of the Catholick Church: for sure Patriarchs

archs are far from being Essential parts of the Catholick Church.

For, 9. We conclude, As in the Papists own Judgement, the Catholick Church may be without the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, or *Antioch*; so may it therefore without the Pope of *Rome*.

And especially I desire the Reader to note, that all the Greek Church which hath set up the Patriarch of *Constantinople* in competition with the Pope, must needs hold that the Universal primacy is of humane institution: For *Constantinople* never pretended to a Divine Institution: And they could never have had the Impudency as to prefer a humane before a Divine: and therefore never thought the Primacy of *Rome* to be *jure Divino*.

CHAP. XX.

Detect. 11. THE great endeavour of the Papists is to *advance Tradition*: The Council of *Trent Sess.* 4. hath equalled it with the Scriptures, as to the *pious affection and reverence* wherewith they receive it. On pretence of this Tradition they have added abundance of new Articles to the faith, and accuse us as Hereticks for not receiving their Traditions: And this is a principal difference betwixt us, that we take the Scriptures to be sufficient, to acquaint us with the will of God, as the Rule of faith and holy living: and they take it to be but part of the word of God, and that the other part is in unwritten Tradition, which they equal with this (as before.) For the maintaining of Tradition it is that they write so much to the dishonour of the holy Scripture, as you may find in *Rushworths* Dialogues, and *Tho. Whites* Defence of them, and many others;

others; so like to the Arguments and Language of the Seekers and Infidels, that we can scarcely know whom we hear when they speak to us.

For the discovery of their desperate fraud in this point, and the right confuting of them: 1. You must distinguish them out of their confusion: 2. You must grant them all that is true and just, which we shall as stifly defend as they: 3. You must reject their errors and confute them: And 4. You may turn their own principal weapon against them, to the certain destruction of their cause.

Of all these briefly in course.

1. For the first two I have spoke at large in the Preface to the second part of the *Saints Rest*, and in the determination in the first part of my Book against Infidelity. But briefly to touch some of the most necessary things here, 1. We must distinguish the Tradition of the Scriptures, or the Scripture doctrine, from the Tradition of other doctrines, pretended to be the rest of the word of God. 2. We must distinguish between a certain proved Tradition, and that which is unproved and uncertain, if not grosly feigned. 3. We must distinguish between the Tradition of the whole Catholick Church, or the greater part, and the Tradition of the lesser more corrupted selfish part (even the *Roman* part.) 4. We must distinguish between a Tradition of necessary doctrine or practice, and the Tradition of mutable Orders. 5. And we must distinguish between Tradition by way of Testimony, or History, or by way of Teaching Ministry, and Tradition by way of Decisive Judgement, as to the Universal Church. Suffer them not to jumble all these together, if you would not be cheated in the dark.

2. And then concerning Tradition, we grant all these following Propositions, (so that it is not all Tradition that we deny.)

1. We

1. We grant that the Holy Scriptures come down to us by the certain Tradition of our Fathers and Teachers; and that what the seeing and hearing of the Apostles was to them that lived with them, that Tradition and belief of certain Tradition is to us, by reason of our distance from the time and place: So that though the Scripture bear its own evidence of a Divine Author, in the image and superscription of God upon it, yet we are beholden to Tradition for the Books themselves, and for much of our knowledge that these are the true writings of the Apostles and Prophets, and *all*, and *not depraved*, &c.

2. We thankfully acknowledge that the *Essentials* of the faith, (and more) hath been delivered even from the Apostles in other ways or forms, besides the Scriptures: as 1. In the *Professions* of the Churches faith. 2. In the *baptismal Covenant* and *signs*, and *whole administration*. 3. In the *Sacrament of the Lords Supper*. 4. In *Catechisms or Catechizings*. 5. In the *prayers and praises of the Church*. 6. In the *hearts of all true Believers*, where God hath written all the *Essentials* of the Christian Faith and Law: So that we will not do as the Papists perversly do: When God delivereth us the Christian Religion with *two hands*, *Scripture* (compleatly) and *Verbal Tradition*, (in the Essentials;) they quarrel with the one hand (Scripture) on pretence of defending the other: so will not we quarrel with *Tradition* (the other hand:) but thankfully confess a *Tradition* of the same Christianity by unwritten means, which is delivered more fully in the *Scripture*: and this Tradition is in some respect *subordinate* to Scripture, and in some respect co-ordinate, as the spirits left hand, as it were, to hold us out the truth.

3. We confess that the Apostles delivered the Gospel by voice as well as by writing, and that before they wrote it to the Churches,

4. By this preaching we confeſs there were Chriſtians made, that had the Doctrine of Chriſt in their hearts, and Churches gathered that had his ordinances among them, before the Goſpel was written.

5. And we confeſs that the Converted were bound to teach what they had received to their Children, ſervants and others.

6. And that there was a ſetled Miniſtry in many Churches ordained to preach the Goſpel as they had received it from the Apoſtles before it was written.

7. And that the ſaid ordinances of Baptiſm, Catechizing, Profeſſions, Euchariſt, Prayer, Praiſe, *&c.* were inſtituted and in uſe, before the Goſpel was written for the Churches.

8. And that when the Goſpel was written, as Tradition bringeth it to us, ſo Miniſters are commiſſioned to deliver both the Books and the Doctrine of this Book, as the Teachers of the Church, and to preach it to thoſe without, for their converſion.

9. And that Parents and Maſters are bound to teach this Doctrine to their Children and Servants: yea if a Miniſter or other perſon were caſt into the *Indies* or *America* without a Bible, he muſt teach the Doctrine, though he remembred not the words: And by ſo doing might ſave ſouls.

10. We grant that to the great benefit of the Church, the *Writers* of all ages have in ſubſerviency to Scripture delivered down the Sacred Verities, and Hiſtorians the matters of fact.

11. And that the unanimous Conſent of all the Churches, manifeſted in their conſtant profeſſions, and practices, is a great confirmation to us.

12. And ſo is the ſuffering of the Martyrs for the ſame truth.

13. And

13. And the Declarations of such consent by Councils is also a confirming Tradition.

14. And the Confessions of Hereticks, Jews and other Infidels, are Providential and Historical Traditions, for confirmation.

15. And we profess that if we had any certain proof of a Tradition from the Apostles of any thing more than is written in Scripture, we would receive it: All this we grant them for Tradition.

3. But in these points following we oppose them. 1. We take the holy Scriptures as the Compleat universal Rule or Law of Faith and Holy living, and we know of no Tradition that containeth another word of God; Nay we know *there is none such* because the Scripture is true, which asserteth its *own sufficiency*. *Scripture*, and *unwritten Tradition* are but two ways of acquainting the world with the *same* Christian Doctrine; and not with divers parts of that Doctrine, so as that Tradition should add to Scripture: yea contrarily it is but the substance of greatest Verities that are conveyed by unwritten Tradition: but that and much more is contained in the Scripture, where the Christian Doctrine is compleat, and containeth the Integrals as well as the Essentials.

2. The manner of delivery in a form of words, which no man may alter, and in so much fulness and perspicuity, is much to be preferred before the meer verbal delivery of the *same Doctrine*. For 1. The Memory of man is not so strong as to retain as much as the Bible doth contain, and preserve it safe from alterations or Corruptions; Or if one man were of so strong a memory, no man can imagine that all or most should be so: Or if one Generation had such wonderful memories, we cannot imagine that all their posterity should have the like. If there were no Statute Books, Records, or Law-

books in *England*, our Laws would be but sorrily kept, and obeyed and executed.

2. If all the world had such miraculous memories, yet men are apt to be negligent either in learning or keeping of holy Doctrine; All have not that zeal that should excite them to such wonderful diligence without which such a treasure could not be preserved: And the negligent would be the major part.

3. When matter and so much matter, is committed to bare memory without a form of unalterable words, new words may make an alteration before men are aware: The change of one word sometimes doth make a whole discourse seem to have another sense.

4. There are so many carnal men in the world that love not the strictness of that Doctrine which they do profess, and so many Hereticks that would pervert the Holy Doctrine, that it would purposely be altered by them if it could be done; and it might much more easily be done, if it lay all upon mens memories: For one party would set their memory against the others, and (as it was about *Easter* a publick matter of fact) tradition would be set against tradition: especially when the far greater part of the Church turn Hereticks, as in the Arians days, then Tradition would be most at their keeping and interpretation; and if we had not then had the unalterable Scriptures, what might they not have done?

5. A whole Body of Doctrine kept only in Memory, will be soon disjoynted and dislocate; and if the matter were kept safe, yet the *method and manner* would be lost.

6. And there could not be such satisfactory Evidence given to another of the Integrity or Certainty of it, as when it is preserved in writing. We should all be diffident that the Laws of *England* were corrupted, or that Lawyers

Lawyers might combine to do it at their pleasure, if there were no Law Books or Records, but all lay in their memories. If they were never so faithful, yet they could not give us such evidence of it.

I do not think any man of common reason can heartily believe, that all the the holy Truths of God, Historical, Doctrinal, Practical, Prophetical, *&c.* could (without a course of miracles, or extraordinary means) have been kept through all ages, as well without writing, as with it.

7. And if writing be not necessary, why have we so many Fathers, Histories, and Canons? And why do they fetch their Tradition from these, and ridiculously call them unwritten verities? Are they unwritten, when they turn us to so many volumes for them? And if mans writing be necessary for their preservation, methinks men should thankfully acknowledge that God hath taken the best way in giving it us in his own unalterable phrase.

3. If they do prove that some matters of fact are made known to us by Tradition that are not in the Scripture, or that any Church Orders or Circumstances of worship then used are so made known to us, (which yet we wait for the proof of,) it will not follow that any of these are therefore Divine Institutions, or universal Laws for the unchangable obligation of the whole Church. If there be some things Historically related in the Scripture, that were obligatory but for a season, and ordained occasionally, and ceased when the occasion ceased (as the Love-feasts, the Kiss of Love, the washing of feet, the abstaining from things strangled and blood, the anointing the sick, the Propheſyings one by one, mentioned 1 *Cor.* 14. 31. miraculous gifts and their exercise, *&c.*) then it will not follow, if they could prove that the Apostles fasted in the Lent, or used

the sign of the Cross in Baptism or holy Ordinances, or confirmed with a Cross in Chrysme, *&c.* that therefore they intended these as universal Laws to the Church; though I suppose they will never prove that they used the things themselves.

4. We will never take the Popes Decision or bare word for a Proof of Tradition: nor will we receive it from pretended Authority, but from rational Evidence. It is not their saying, *We are the authorized keepers of Tradition*, that shall go with us for proof.

5. And therefore it is not the Testimony of the Papists alone, (who are not only a lesser part of the Church, but a part that hath espoused a corrupt interest against the rest) that we shall take for certain proof of a Tradition, but we will prefer the Testimonie of the whole Catholick Church before the *Romish* Church alone.

6. They that can produce the best Records of Antiquity, or rational proof of the Antiquity of the thing they plead for, though they be but a few Learned Antiquaries, may yet be of more regard in the matter of Tradition than millions of the vulgar, or unlearned men: so that with us, *Universal Tradition* is preferred before the Tradition of the *Romish sect*, and *Rational proof* of Antiquity is preferred before *ignorant surmises*. But where both these concur, both *universal consent*, *and records* or other credible evidence of Antiquity, it is most valid.

And as for the Romish Traditions which they take for the other part of Gods word: 1. In all Reason they must produce their sufficient proof that they came from the Apostles, before we can receive them as Apostolick Traditions. And when they have done that, they must prove that it was delivered by the Apostles as a perpetual Universal Doctrine or Law for the whole Church: and when they have well proved both these, we shall hearken further to them. 2. Either

2. Either these Traditions have Evidence to prove them Apostolical, or no Evidence. If none, how can the Pope know them? If they have Evidence, why may not we know it as well as the Pope? at least, by the helps that his Charity doth vouchsafe the world.

3. If there be any Proof of these Traditions, it is either some Antient Records or Monuments; and then our Learned Antiquaries may better know them than a multitude of the unlearned: Or it is the Practice of the Church: And then 1. How shall we know how long that practice hath continued, without recourse to the writings of the Ancients? The reports of the people are in many cases very uncertain. 2. But if it may be known without the search of Antient Records, then we may know it as well as they.

4. If the Pope and Clergy have been the keepers of it, have they in all ages kept it to themselves or declared it to the Church? (I mean to all in common.) If they have concealed it, 1. Then it seems it belonged not to others. 2. Or else they were unfaithful and unfit for the office. 3. And then how do succeeding Popes and Clergy know it? If they divulged it, then others know it as well as they. We have had abundance of Preachers from among the Papists, that were once Papists themselves, as *Luther*, *Melancthon*, *Zuinglius*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Peter Martyr*, *Bucer*, &c. and yet these knew not of your truly Apostolical Traditions.

5. And it mars your credit with us, because we are able to prove the beginning of some of your traditions, or a time when they had no being, since the death of the Apostles.

6. And also that we are able to prove the death and burial of many things that have gone long under the name of Traditions.

7. And when we find so lame an account from your

ſelves of the true Apoſtolical Traditions. You are ſo confounded between your Eccleſiaſtical Decrees and Traditions, and your Apoſtolical Traditions, that we deſpair of learning from you to know one from the other: and of ſeeing under the hand of his Holineſs and a General Council a Catalogue of the true Apoſtolical Traditions. And ſure it ſeems to us ſcarce fair dealing that in one thouſand and five hundered years time, (if indeed there have been Popes ſo long) the Church could never have an enumeration and deſcription of theſe Traditions, with the proofs of them. Had you told us which are Apoſtolick Traditions but as fully and plainly, as the Scriptures which you accuſe of inſufficiency and obſcurity, do deliver us their part, you had diſcharged your pretended truſt.

8. And it is in our eyes an abominable impiety, for you to equal your Traditions with the holy Scripture, till you have enumerated and proved them. And it makes us the more to ſuſpect your Traditions, when we perceive that they or their Patrons have ſuch an enmity to the Holy Scriptures, that they cannot be rightly defended without caſting ſome reproach upon the Scriptures. But this we do not much wonder at: for it is no new thing with the applauders of Tradition. We find the eighth General Council at *Conſtantinople*, *Can.* 3. decreeing, that [*the Image of Chriſt be adored with equal Honour with the Holy Scripture*;] But whether that be an Apoſtolical Tradition, we doubt.

9. And if General Councils themſelves, and that of your own, ſhould be for the ſufficiency of Scripture; what then is become of all your Traditions? Search your own *Binnius*, *pag.* 299. whether it paſt not as ſound Doctrine at the Council of *Baſil* (*in Raguſii Orat.*) *Sup.* 6. [*that faith and all things neceſſary to ſalvation, both matters of belief, and matters of practice,*

are

are founded in the literal ſenſe (of Scripture) *and only from that may argumentation be taken for the proving of thoſe things that are matters of faith, or neceſſary to ſalvation; and not from thoſe paſſages that are ſpoken by allegory, or other ſpiritual ſence.*] Sup. 7. [☞ *The Holy Scripture in the literal ſenſe ſoundly and well underſtood, is the infallible and moſt ſufficient Rule of faith*] Is not here enough againſt all other Traditional Articles of faith? A plain man would think ſo. Yea, but *Binnius* noteth that he meaneth that explicitely or implicitely it is ſo. Well! I confeſs the beſt of you are ſlippery enough: but let us grant this; (for indeed he ſo explaineth himſelf afterward:) yet that's nothing for Tradition. He there maintaineth that Scripture is the *Rule of Faith* (not part of the Rule). [*For* (ſaith he) *when the intellect hapneth to err, as in hereticks, its neceſſary that there be ſome Rule, by the deviation or conformity to which the intellect may perceive that it doth or doth not err. Elſe it would be ſtill in doubt and fluctuate* ——— *It appeareth that no humane ſcience is the Rule of Faith. It remaineth therefore that the Holy Scripture is this Rule of Faith. This is the Rule,* John 20 *where he ſaith, Theſe things are written that you might believe, that Jeſus is the Son of God, and believing might have life in his name. And* 2 Pet. 2. *You have a more ſure word of prophecy to which ye do well that ye attend as to a light,* &c. *And* Rom. 15. *Whatſoever things were written, were written for our learning,* &c. —— *And its plain that the foreſaid authorities are of Holy Scripture; and ſpeak of the Holy Scripture,* &c. *The ſecond part alſo is plain, becauſe if the Holy Scripture were not a ſufficient Rule of Faith, it would follow that the Holy Ghoſt had inſufficiently delivered it, who is the author of it: which is by no means to be thought of God, whoſe works are all perfect. More-*

over

over if the Holy Scripture were wanting in any things that are neceſſary to ſalvation, then thoſe things that are wanting might lawfully and deſervedly be ſuperadded from ſome thing elſe (aliunde), *or if any thing were ſuperfluous, be diminiſhed. But this is forbidden*, Rev. 22. *From whence its plain that in Scripture there is nothing defective, and nothing ſuperfluous; which is agreeable to its author, the Holy Ghoſt, to whoſe Omnipotency it agreeeth that nothing diminutely, to his Wiſdom that nothing ſuperfluouſly, and to his Goodneſs that in a congruous order, he provide for the Neceſſity of our ſalvation*, Prov. 30. 5, 6. *The word of God is a fiery buckler to them that hope in him: Add thou not to his words leſt he reprove thee, and thou be found a lyar.*] How like you all this in a Popiſh General Council? and in an Oration againſt the Sacrament in both kinds?

Well! but perhaps the diſtinction unſaith all again? No ſuch matter; you ſhall hear it truly recited. He proceeds thus [*But for the further declaration of this Rule as to that part, it muſt be known, that the ſufficiency of any Doctrine is neceſſarily to be underſtood two ways; one way Explicitely, another way Implicitely. And this is true in every Doctrine or ſcience, becauſe no doctrine was ever ſo ſufficiently delivered, that all the Concluſions contained in its printiples, were delivered and expreſſed explicitely and in the proper terms: and ſo it is in our purpoſe: becauſe there is nothing that any way or in any manner* (N. B.) *pertaineth to faith and ſalvation, which is not moſt ſufficiently contained in the Holy Scripture explicitely or implicitely. Hence ſaith* Auſtin [☞ *Every truth is contained in the Scriptures*, latent *or* patent, *as in other ſciences Speculative or Moral and Civil, the Concluſions and determinations are contained in their principles*, &c. *and the deduction is by way of inference or determinati-*

on

on ———] This is the plain Protestant Doctrine. There is nothing any way necessary to faith or salvation, but what is contained in the Scriptures, either expressly, or as the Conclusion in the premises. Good still! we desire no more. Let holy Reason then discern the Conclusion in the premises, and let us not be sent for it to the Authority of *Rome*; nay sent for some thing else, that is no Conclusion deducible from any Scripture principles. We grant Tradition or Church practices are very useful for our better understanding of some Scriptures: But what is this to another Traditional word of God? Prove your Traditions but by *inference* from Scripture, and we will receive them.

Yet let us hear this Orator further clearing his mind [*Adding to a Doctrine may be understood four ways.* 1. *By way of explication or declaration.* 2. *By way of supply.* 3. *By way of ampliation.* 4. *By way of destruction, or contrary. The first way is necessary in every science and Doctrine, and specially in Holy Scripture; not for it self, which is most sufficient, and most clear in it self, but for us:* (This we all yield.) *The second way is necessary to sciences diminutely and insufficiently delivered by their Authors, for their supplement*: so Aristotle *is supplemented by* Albertus Magnus, *&c. The third way, specially if it be not excessive, is tolerable to the well being, though it be not necessary. The fourth way —— assertively is to be rejected as Poyson —— Thus are the authorities to be understood: that forbid to add to, or diminish from the Scripture,* Deut. 12. 32.]

Well! by this time you may see, that when such Doctrine as this for Scripture. Sufficiency and perfection as the Rule of Faith and life, admitting no addition as necessary, but explication, nor any other as tolerable, but moderate ampliation (which indeed is the same;) I say, when this Doctrine past so lately in a Popish General

neral Council, you may see that the very Doctrine of Traditions equaled with Scripture, or being another word of God, necessary to faith and salvation, containing what is wanting in Scripture, is but lately sprung up in the world. And sure the Traditions themselves be not old then, when the conceit of them came but lately into the world.

4. Well: I have done the three first parts of this task: but the chief is yet behind, which is to shew 1. How little the Papists get by their Argument from Tradition. 2. And how much they lose by it: even all their cause.

1. Two things they very much plead Tradition for: The one is their private Doctrines and practices, in which they disagree from other Christians: and here they lose their labour with the judicious. 1. Because they give us no sufficient proof that their Tradition is Apostolical. 2. Because the dissent of other Churches sheweth that it is not universal: with other Reasons before mentioned.

2. The other Cause which they plead Tradition for, is the Doctrine of Christianity it self. And this they do in design to lead men to the Church of *Rome*: as if we must be no Christians, unless we are Christians upon the credit of the Pope, and his Subjects. And here I offer to their Consideration these two things, to shew them the vanity of their arguing.

1. We do not strive against you in producing any Tradition or Testimony of Antiquity for the Scripture, or for Scripture Doctrine: We make as much advantage of such just Tradition as you. What do such men as *White*, *Vane*, *Cressy*, &c. think of, when they argue so eagerly for the advantage of Tradition to prove the Scripture and Christian faith? Is this any thing against us? Nothing at all. We accept our Religion from both the hands of Providence that bring it us; Scripture and Tradition;

Tradition: we abhor the contempt which these partial Disputers cast upon Scripture; but we are not therefore so partial our selves as to refuse any collateral or subordinate help for our faith. The more Testimonies, the better. The best of us have need of all the advantages for our faith that we can get. When they have extolled the Certainty of Tradition to the highest, we gladly joyn with them, and accept of any certain Tradition of the mind of God. And I advise all that would prove themselves wise defenders of the faith, to take heed of rejecting Arguments from Providences, or any necessary Testimony of man, especially concerning matter of fact, or of rejecting true Church History, because the Papists overvalue it under the name of Tradition, lest such prove guilty of the like partiality and injuriousness to the truth as the Papists are. And whereas the Papists imagine, that this must lead us to their Church for Tradition, I answer that in my next observation, which is,

2. We go beyond the Papists in arguing for just Tradition of the Christian faith, and we make far greater advantage of it than they can do. For 1. They argue but from Authoritative Decision by the Pope, under the name of Church Tradition (excepting the French party); whereas we argue from true History and certain Antiquity, and prove what we say.

Where note 1. That their Tradition is indeed no Tradition: for if it must be taken upon the credit of a man as supposed Infallible by supernatural (if not miraculous) endowment, this is not Tradition but Prophesie. And if they prove the man to be such a man, its all one to the Church whether he say that [*This was the Apostles Doctrine*, or, *This I deliver my self to you from God.*] For if he were so qualified, he had the power and credit of a Prophet or Apostle himself. And therefore

fore they must prove the Pope to be a Prophet, before their kind of Tradition can get credit: and when they have done that, there is no need of it: this Their honest Dr. *Holden* was ware of, upon which he hath so handsomely canvassed them.

2. Note also that such as Dr. *Holden*, *Cressy*, *Vane*, *White* and others of the French way that plead for Tradition, mean a quite other thing than the Jesuited *Italian* Papist means; and while they plead for universal Tradition, they come nearer to the Protestants, than to their Brethren, if they did not contradict themselves, when they have done, by making meer Romish Tradition to be *Universal*.

3. Note also, that when Papists speak of Tradition confusedly, they give us just reason to call them to Define their Tradition, and tell us what they mean by it, before we dispute with them upon an ambiguous word; seeing they are so divided among themselves, that one party understands one thing by it, and another another thing; which we must not suffer these jugglers to jumble together and confound.

2. Another advantage in which we go beyond the Papists for Tradition, is, that as we argue not from the meer pretended supernatural Infallibility or Authority of any, as they do, but from rational Evidence of true Antiquity; so we argue not from a *sect or party* as they do, but from the *Universal Church*: As far as the whole Church of Christ is of larger extent and greater credit than the Popish party, so far is our *Tradition* more Credible than theirs. And that is especially in three things.

1. The Papists are fewer by far than the rest of the Christians in the world. And the testimony of many, yea of all, is more than of a part. 2. The Papists above other parties have espoused an interest that leads

leads them to pretend and corrupt Tradition, and bend all things to that interest of their own, that they may Lord it over all the world: But the whole Church can have no such Interest and Partiality. 3. And the Papists are but one side; and he that will judge rightly, must hear the other sides speak too. But the Tradition that we make use of, is from all sides concurring; yea Papists themselves in many points.

Yea our Tradition reacheth further than the Universal Church: for we take in all rational Evidence: even of Jews, Heathens, and Hereticks, and Persecutors, that bear witness to the matters of fact, and what was the doctrine and practice of the Christians in their times, and what Books they made the ground of their faith. So that as true Universal impartial naturally-or-rationally-infallible History or Testimony, differeth from a private, pretended-prophetical assertion, or from the Testimony of one party only; so doth our Tradition excel both the sorts of Popish Tradition, both that of the Papal, and that of the Council-party. And now judge who may better boast of or extol Tradition, they or we; and to what purpose, *Cressy*, *White*, and such men do bring their discourses of Tradition.

2. But yet we have not so done with them, till Tradition have given them their mortal stroak. You appeal to Tradition, to Tradition you shall go. But what Tradition mean you? The Tradition of the Catholick Church? And where is this to be found and known? but in the profession and practice of the Church, and in the Records of the Church? Well then! of both these let us enquire.

The first and great Question between you and us, is, *Whether the Pope be the Head and Soveraign Ruler of the whole Catholick Church?* and then *Whether the Catholick*

Catholick Church and the Roman *are of equal extent?* What saith *Tradition* to this?

1. Let us enquire of the *present* Church: and there we have the profession and practice of all the Greek Church; the Syrians, the Moscovites, the Georgians, and all others of the Greek Religion dispersed throughout the Turks Dominions, with the Jacobites, Armenians, Egyptians, Abassines, with all other Churches in *Europe*, *&c.* that disclaim the Headship of the *Roman* Pope; all these do with one mouth proclaim that the Church of *Rome* is not, and ought not to be the Mistress of the world, or of all other Churches, but that the Pope for laying such a claim is an usurper, if not the Anti-Christ. This is the Tradition of the Greeks; this is the Tradition of the Abassines: the far greatest part of the Church on earth agree in this. Mark then what is become of the *Roman* Soveraignty, by the verdict of Tradition; even from the vote of the greatest part of the Church. *Rome* hath no right to its pretended Soveraignty, *Babylon* is faln, by the judgement of Tradition.

If you have the faces again to say that all these are Hereticks or Schismaticks, and therefore have no vote, We answer. If a minor party, and that so partial and corrupt, seeking Dominion over the rest, may step into the Tribunal, and pass sentence against the Catholick Church, or the greatest part of it, blame not others, if on far better grounds they do so by that part. And for shame do not any more hereafter use any such self-condemning words, as to ask any Sect, [*How dare you condemn the Catholick Church? Do you think all the Church is forsaken but you*, &c.] And let us ask you, as you teach your followers to ask us [*If we must turn from the Universal Church to any Sect, why rather to yours*

yours than another? why not as well to the Anabaptists, or other party, as to the Papists?]

But your common saying is, that the *Greeks, Protestants, and all the rest were once of your Church, and departing from it, they can have no Tradition but yours, for their spring is with you.* To which we answer 1. The vanity of this your fiction shall by and by be answered by it self. 2. You say so, and they say otherwise: why should we believe you that are a smaller, partial and corrupted part? 3. Well then let us go to former ages, seeing it is not the present Church whose voice you will regard (only by the way, I pray forget not, 1. That you do ill then to call us still to the Judgement of the *present Church*, and dare not stand to it. 2. And that you do ill to perswade men that the greater part of the Church cannot err, if you sentence the greater part as Schismaticks or Revolters.) But how shall we know the way and mind of the ages *past?* If by the *present age*, then the greater part giveth us in their sence against you. If by the Records of those times, we are content to hear the the Testimony of these. And first when we look into the Antients themselves, we find them generally against you; and we find in that which is antiquity indeed, no footsteps of your usurped Soveraignty, but a contrary frame of Government, and a consent of antiquity against it. 2. When we look into later History we find, how by the advantage of *Romes* temporal greatness and the Emperours residence there your greatness begun, and preparation was made to your usurpation, and how the translation of the Imperial Seat to *Constantinople* made them your Competitors, yea to begin in the claim of an universal Headship; and we find how it being once made a question, you got it by a murthering Emperour resolved on your side for his own ad-

vantage. We find that it was long, even till *Hildebrands* days, before you could get any great poſſeſſion, for all this ſentence. It would but be tedious here to recite our Hiſtorical Evidence: we refer you to what is done already by *Goldaſtus and Biſhop* Uſher *de ſtatu & ſucceſſ. Eccleſiar.* and in his *Anſwer to the Jeſuits Challenge*, and in his Diſcourſe of the Antient Religion of *Ireland*, &c. eſpecially by *Blondel* in his French Treatiſe of Primacy, and Dr. *Field*, and many others that have already given you the Teſtimony of Antiquity. More than you can give a reaſonable anſwer to, I have produced in my Book called the *Safe Religion.* In plain Engliſh, inſtead of *Apoſtolical Tradition for your Soveraignty*; we find that eight hundred years after the days of Chriſt, you had not neer ſo much of the Catholick Church in your ſubjection, as you have now: that at four hundred, or five hundred, if not till ſix hundred years after Chriſt, you had no known part of the world that acknowledged your Univerſal Soveraignty; but only the Latine Weſtern Church ſubmitted to the Pope as their Patriarch, and the *Patriarch primæ ſedis*, the firſt in order among the Patriarchs: and that before the days of *Conſtantine* and the *Nicene* Council, he was but a Biſhop of the richeſt and moſt numerous Church of Chriſtians: and we ſee no proof that, of an hundred years after Chriſt, he was any more than the chief Presbyter of a particular Church.

If all this will not ſerve, we have *National Evidences* beyond all exception, that the Ethiopian Churches of *Habaſſia*, the *Indians*, *Perſians*, &c. were never your ſubjects to this day. That *England*, *Scotland*, and *Ireland* here in your Weſtern Circuits, were not only long from under you, but reſiſted you, maintaining the Council of *Calcedon* againſt you, and joyning

joyning with the Eastern Churches against you, about Easter day, &c. And that the Eastern Churches and many great Nations, (as *Tenduc*, *Nubia*, &c.) that now are revolted, were never your subjects, and some of them had little to do with you.

And yet if all this will not serve, we have your own Confessions. I have elsewhere mentioned some: *Canus Loc. Theol. lib.* 6. *cap.* 7. *fol.* 201. saith [*Not only the Greeks, but almost all the rest of the Bishops of the whole world, have vehemently fought to destroy the Priviledge of the Church of* Rome: *and indeed they had on their side, both the Arms of Emperours, and the greater number of Churches: and yet they could never prevail to abrogate the Power of the one Pope of* Rome.] Mark here whether the Catholick Church was then your subjects, when the greater number of Churches, and most of the Bishops of the whole world, as well as the Greeks, were against you, and vehemently fought against your pretended priviledges.

Rainerius (supposed) *contra Waldenses Catal. in Bibliotheca Patrum, Tom.* 4. *p.* 773. saith [*The Churches of the Armenians, and Ethiopians, and Indians, and the rest which the Apostles converted, are not under the Church of* Rome.] Read and blush, and call *Baronius* a parasite. What would you have truer or plainer? And what Controversie can there be, where so many Nations themselves are witnesses against you? And you may conjecture at the numbers of those Churches by what a Legate of the Popes that lived among them, saith of one Corner of them, *Jacob. à Vitriaco Histor. Orient. cap.* 77. that [*the Churches in the Easterly parts of* Asia *alone exceeded in multitude the Christians both of the Greek and Latine Churches.*] Alas, how little a thing then was the *Roman* Catholick Church!

If all this were not enough, the Tradition of your own Catholick Church is ready to destroy the Papacy utterly. For that [*a General Council is above the Pope, and may judge him and depose him, and that it is* de fide, *and that its Heresie to deny it, and that all this is so sure that* ne unquam aliquis peritorum dubitavit, *no wise man ever doubted of it*,] all this is the judgement of the General Council of *Basil*, with whom that of *Constance* doth agree; And whether these Councils were confirmed or not, they confess them lawfully called and owned, and extraordinary full: and so they were their Catholick Church Representative; and so the Popes Soveraignty over the Council is gone by Tradition: but that's not the worst. For, if a free General Council should be called, all the Churches in the world must be equally there represented: And if they were so, then down went the usurped Head-ship of the Pope: For we are sure already that most of the Churches in the world are against it: and therefore in Council they would have the Major vote. And thus by the concession of the *Roman* Representative Catholick Church the Pope is gone by Tradition. So that by that time they have well considered of the matter, me thinks they should be less zealous for Tradition.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXI.

Detect. 12. ANother of the *Roman* frauds is this: *They perſwade men that the Greeks, the Proteſtants, and all other Churches, were once under their Papal Soveraignty, and have ſeparated themſelves without any juſt cauſe: and therefore we are all ſchiſmaticks; and therefore have no vote in general Councils*, &c.

A few words may ſerve to ſhew the vanity of this accuſation. 1. Abundance of the Churches were ſo ſtrange to you, that they had not any notable communion with you. 2. The Greek Churches withdrew from your Communion, but not from your ſubjection. If any of the Patriarchs or Emperours of *Conſtantinople* did for carnal ends at laſt ſubmit to you, it was not till lately, nor was it the act of the Churches, nor owned, nor of long continuance. So that it was your Communion and not your ſubjection that they withdrew from.

And as for us of the Weſtern parts, we anſwer you, 1. We that are now living, our Fathers, or our Grandfathers, were not of your Church: and therefore we never did withdraw.

2. There were Churches in *England* before the *Roman* Power was here owned: And therefore if it was a ſin to *change*, the *firſt change* was the ſin, when they ſubjected themſelves to you; and not the later, in which they returned to their ancient ſtate.

3. And for the Germans or Engliſh or whoever did relinquiſh you, they have as good reaſon for it, as for the relinquiſhing of any other ſin. If they did by the unhappineſs of ill education or deluſion, ſubmit to the

uſurped Soveraignty of the Pope they had no reaſon to continue in ſuch an error. Repentance is not a Vice, when the thing Repented of is a vice. Juſtifie therefore your uſurpation, or elſe it is in vain to be angry with us for not adhering to the uſurper, and the many corruptions that he brought into the Church.

CHAP. XXII.

Detect. 13. ANother deceit that they manage with great confidence, is this; Say they, *If the Church of* Rome *be the true Church: then yours is not the true Church, and then you are Schiſmaticks in ſeparating from it: But the Church of* Rome *is the true Church; For you will confeſs it was once a true Church: when* Paul *wrote the Epiſtle to the* Romans: *and if it ceaſed to be a true Church, tell us when it ceaſed, if you can: If it ceaſed to be a true Chruch; it was either by hereſie, or Schiſm or Apoſtacy: but by none of theſe: therefore,* &c.

A man would think that Children and Women ſhould ſee the palpable fallacy of this Argument; and yet I hear of few that the learned Papiſts make more uſe of. But to lay open the ſhame of it in brief I anſwer. 1. The deceit lieth in the ambiguity of the Word [*Church.*] As to our preſent purpoſe, obſerve that it hath theſe ſeveral ſignifications. 1. It is taken oft in Scripture for *one particular Church, aſſociated for perſonal communion in Gods Worſhip.* And thus there were many Churches in a Country, as *Judea, Galatia, &c.* 2. It is taken by Eccleſiaſtical writers often for an *Aſſociation of many of theſe Churches for Communion by their Paſtors*; ſuch as were Dioceſan, Provincial, National Churches; whereof moſt were then ruled by Aſſemblies, where a Biſhop,

Bishop, Arch-bishop, Metropolitan or Patriarch (as they called them) did preside. 3. It is taken oft in Scripture for *the Body of Christ*; *the holy Catholick or Universal Church containing all true Believers as mystical, or all Professors of true faith as visible.* 4. It is taken by the Papists oft for *one particular Church which is the Mistris or Ruler of all other Churches.*

And now I come to apply these in answer to the argument. 1. If the Question be of a *true particular Church*, we grant you that the Church of *Rome* was a true and noble Church, in the days of *Paul* and long after; and thus *Paul* owneth it in his Epistle as a true Church. And to the question when it ceased to be a true Church: I answer, 1, What matter is it to us whether it be ceased or not, any more than whether *Corinth*, *Ephesus*, *Coloss*, *Thessalonica*, or *Jerusalem* be true Churches or ceased? In charity we regard them all: but otherwise what is it to the faith or salvation of the world, whether *Rome* or any one of these be yet a true Church, or be ceased? I know not well whether there be any Church at *Coloss* or *Philippi*, or some other places that had then true Churches: And doth it therefore follow that I am not a true believer? What would you say to such a fellow that should argue thus concerning other Churches, as these men do of *Rome?* and say, e.g. [*If* Philippi, *be a true Church, then* England *are no true Churches, If it be not, when did it cease to be a true Church?*] Would you not answer him, [*What is it to me whether* Philippi *be a true Church or not? May not we and they be both true Churches? How prove you that? And whether it be ceased or not ceased, doth no whit concern my faith or salvation, further than as my charity is to be exercised towards them*] So say we of *Rome*: It was a true particular Church in the Apostles days. And if it be still a true Church what hinders

but we may be so too? But whether it be so or not, is little to me. It concerneth not my faith or Salvation to know whether there be any such place as *Rome* on earth, or whether it were consumed long ago. If a man were so simple as to believe a report that *Rome* was destroyed by *Charles* of *Bourbon*, and never inhabited, or had a Pope since, he were but such a Heretick as Pope *Zachary* and Bishop *Boniface* made of *Virgilius*, for holding there be Antipodes (though further from the truth.)

2. And if you take the word [*Church*] in the second sence; for a Dioceſan or Patriarchal Church, or Association of Churches; ſuppoſing ſuch forms proved warrantable, the ſame anſwer ſerveth as to the firſt.

3. But (to come to the true ſtate of our Controverſie), If by [*a true Church*] you mean either of the two laſt, that is, 1. The *whole Univerſal Church*: or 2. *A Miſtris Church that muſt Rule all the reſt*, it was never ſuch a true Church in *Pauls* days.

And therefore here we turn this argument of the Papiſts againſt themſelves. *If the Church of* Rome *were neither the whole Catholick Church, nor the Miſtris of all other Churches when* Paul *wrote his Epiſtle to them, then it is not ſo now, nor ought to be ſo accounted. But the former is proved.* 1. That the Church of *Rome* was not the *whole Catholick Church* then, no man that's well in his wits can doubt, that reads what a Church there was at *Jeruſalem*, what a Church at *Epheſus*, and *Philadelphia*, *Smyrna*, *Thyatira*, *Laodicea*, *Corinth*, and abundance more. Prove that all or any of theſe were parts of the Church of *Rome* if you can. 2. Where doth *Paul* once name them either the *Catholick Church, or the Miſtris or Ruler of all Churches?* or give the leaſt hint of any ſuch thing? or mention any Pope among them whom the whole world was to take to be

their

their Soveraign Head? Is it not an incredible thing that *Paul* (and all the Apostles) would forget to make any mention of this priviledge, or teach them how to use it, or teach other Churches their duty in obeying the Church of *Rome*, if indeed they had been made the Mistris Church? Men that can believe what they list, may say what they list. But for my part I will never think so hardly of *Paul* and all the Apostles, as to accuse them of so great oblivion or negligence. And therefore I conclude, *Rome* was neither the Universal Church, nor the Mistris Church then (nor many an age after) and therefore it is not so to be accounted now. So that you see how easily this silly Argument shews its shame.

But (though it concern not our main question) I shall tell them further, that the *Matter* of the *Roman* Church must be distinguished from its *New Political Form*. For the *Matter*, So many of its members as are *true Christians*, are *part of the Catholick Church* of Christ, though not the *whole*: And for the *form*. 1. There is the *form of its several parts*, and the *form of the whole*: The form of any parts of the *Roman* Church that are *Congregations or particular Churches of true Christians*, may make those parts true Churches: that is, There may be many a true Parish Church that yet live under the Papal Yoak. But as to the *Political form of the* Roman *Catholick Church*, *as it is a Body Headed by one claiming an Universal Monarchy*, so the form is false and Antichristian, and therefore the Church as *Papal*, must be denominated from *this form*; and can be no better.

And this is our true answer to the question, *Whether the Church of* Rome *be a true Church?* There are I doubt not among them many a thousand *true members of the Catholick Church*, and there may be *true particular*

cular Churches among them, having true Paſtors and Chriſtian people joyned for Gods worſhip (though I doubt there is but few of them but do fearfully pollute it: and I am confident that ſalvation is much more rare and difficult with them, than it is with the Reformed Catholicks; yet that many among them are true Chriſtians and ſaved, I am fully perſwaded, eſpecially when I have read ſuch writings as *Gerſons*, *Guil. Pariſienſis*, *Ferus*, *Kempis*, &c.) And I think the better of *Bellarmine* himſelf for ſaying of *Kempis de imitatione Chriſti* [*Ego certe ab adoleſcentia & uſq; in ſenectam hoc opuſculum ſæpiſſime volvi, & revolvi, & ſemper mihi novum apparuit, & nunc etiam mirifice cordi meo ſapit. Bellarm. de Scriptor. Eccl. Pag.* 298.]

But the *Pope as a pretended Univerſal Monarch is a falſe Head*, and conſequently *their Papal Church, as ſuch, is a falſe Antichriſtian Church*, and no true Church of Jeſus Chriſt.

CHAP. XXIII.

Detect. 14. ANother great Endeavour of the Papiſts is, *to make men believe that They only have a fixedneſs, unity, conſiſtency and ſetledneſs in Religion: but we are ſtill at uncertainty and to ſeek, incoherent, not tyed together by any certain bond, but ſtill upon diviſions, and upon change*: And they inſtance thus [*A while ago you were Epiſcopal, and then Presbyterian, and now you are nothing, but every one goes his own way: A while ago you worſhipped God in one manner, in Baptiſing, Marrying, Burying, Common Prayer, the Lords Supper; and now you have all new. Where is the Church of* England *now? Some of you*

You are for one Government, and some for another: the Lutherans have Superintendents, the Calvinists are Presbyterians: And what names of reproach do the Episcopal give the Presbyterians? and the Presbyterians take them to be Antichristian. Some of you are Arminians; some Calvinists; some say Christ dyed for all, and some say no; some are for Justification only by Christs Passive Righteousness, and some also by his active; with other such differences even in these fundamental points.]

I repeat their words just as I have heard they make use of them with the people, and now I shall open the deceit of them in particular Answers to each part.

And 1. For the matter of unity, I have spoken of it before, and dare leave it to all the world that are judicious, whether the Papists or we are more unanimous, or more divided. Only to the Instances of division, I shall speak further now. 1. For the matter of Church Government, we are all agreed in the substance of it (except a very few straglers;) As concerning the duty of Penitence, Confession, Restitution, Contrition, and of the Excommunicating the obstinate, and Absolving the penitent, *&c.* All this we agree is the duty of the Presbyters and we agree that these Presbyters may have a President, Only some think that the President is *ejusdem ordinis*, of the same order, differing but in degree, and hath no power *jure divino*, but what the Presbyters have, but only the *exercise* is restrained as to the Presbyters, by *men*; But others think that the President is a Bishop eminently of another order, having not only the exercise, but the power above the Presbyters. And is this difference so great a business? And do not these cheaters know, that if for this they would reproach us, they must do so by themselves? Know they not that among their own Schoolmen there is the same difference, or in most points the same? And know

know they not that if differences in Ceremonies or Modes should unchurch us, or disgrace us, it would fall as foul on the whole Catholick Church, and that in the very primitive times? Did they never read of the difference between the *Asian* and the *Roman* Churches, about the celebration of *Easter* day, and how *Polycrates* and the rest did plead Tradition against the Church of *Romes* Tradition; and how *Irenæus* did reprehend the Bishop of *Rome* for his uncharitable censure of the Churches for so small a difference? And how *Polycarp* and *Anicetus* Bishop of *Rome* could not agree, as building upon contrary Traditions: but yet maintained Christian peace; as *Eusebius* out of *Irenæus* his Epistle to *Victor* tells us, *Lib.* 5. *Hist. Eccl. Cap.* 26. And the English and *Scottish* Churches long after that adhered to the *Asian* way; even after the Council of *Nice* had ended the Controversie on the *Roman* side. And who knows not how many more Controversies greater than these of ours have been among the Churches of Christ, without their unchurching or disparagement to Religion?

And for the Doctrinal Controversies mentioned, most of them lie more in words than in sence, and all of them are far from the foundation, though they be about Christ, who is the Foundation. If one of your picture-drawers mistake the complexion of Christ, or if one should say he was not buried in a sheet, these are errours about Christ that is the foundation, and yet far from the foundation. Those of us that say *Christ dyed for all*, and those that say he *dyed not for all*, do agree as your School-men do, that *he dyed for all, as to the sufficiency of his death and price:* but *he dyed not for all as to the actual efficiency of pardon and salvation:* Is not this your Doctrine? and is not this ours? and are not you as much disagreed about it as we? what else meant the late decision against the Jansenists? and what

meaneth

meaneth the preſent preſecution of them in *France?* And yet have you the faces to make this a reproach of us? And for the *righteouſneß of Chriſt*, we are commonly agreed that it is both his Obedience and Paſſion that we are juſtified and ſaved by: though we are not all of a mind about the *reaſon* of their ſeveral intereſts; which difference is ſo far from unchriſtening us, that it makes no conſiderable odds among our ſelves, who are cenſorious enough in caſes of difference.

And for different forms of worſhip, ſure theſe men do wilfully forget what a number of Offices and Maſs books have been among themſelves and other Churches: and what a number of Letanies or Liturgies of ſeveral ages and Churches they have given us in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. But more of this anon.

2. And as for the *changes and unfixedneß* which they charge us with, we are contented that 1. Our *principles*. 2. And our *practices* be compared with the Papiſts, and then let even modeſt and judicious enemies be judges which of us are more fixed, or more mutable.

1. For our *Principles*: we take only Chriſt to be the chief Foundation of our Faith, and his inſpired Prophets and Apoſtles to be the ſecondary Foundation: whereas the Papiſts build upon many a moſt ungodly ignorant man, becauſe he is the Pope of *Rome*. And which of theſe is the firmer foundation?

2. We take nothing for our *Rule* but the ſure word of God contained in the holy Scriptures: but the Papiſts take the Decrees of all Popes and Councils for their Rule: *Our Rule* they confeſs to be Divine and infallible: *Their Rule* we affirm to be humane and fallible. Which then is like to be more firm? Our Rule (the ſacred Scriptures in the Original languages, as to the *words*, and

and the *matter* of them, as to the *ſence*) the Papiſts themſelves confeſs unchangeable; but whether they will ſay as much of their own, I will try by two or three Inſtances. 1. What an alteration Pope *Sixtus*, and Pope *Clement* made in the Vulgar Latine Bible, which is one part of their Rule, I told you before, and Dr. *James* his *Bellum Papale* will tell you the particulars. 2. The other part is their Decrees, of which Pope *Leo the tenth in Bulla contr. Luth. in Binnius, pag.* 655. ſaith [*the holy Popes our predeceſſors never erred in their Canons and Conſtitutions.*] And yet hear what Pope *Julius* the ſecond ſaith in his General Council at the Laterane with their approbation, *Cont. pragmat. ſanct. monitor. Binnius, vol.* 4. *pag.* 560. [*Though the Inſtitutions of ſacred Canons, holy Fathers, and Popes of* Rome——*and their Decrees be judged immutable, as made by Divine Inſpiration; yet the Pope of* Rome, *who, though of unequal merits, holdeth the place of the Eternal King, and the Maker of all things, and all Laws on earth, may abrogate theſe Decrees when they are abuſed.*]

You ſee here from the mouth of Infallibility it ſelf (if the *Roman* faith have any) of what continuance we may judge their Immutable Decrees to be, which are made as by Divine inſpiration: They are *Immutable* till the *Pope abrogate* them, who being in Gods place, though of unequal merits (O humble confeſſion!) is of power to do it.

3. We have a *Rule that was perfected by Chriſt and his Apoſtles*, to which nothing can be added, and therefore we are at a *Certainty* for our Religion: for we have a ſure and perfect Rule from Heaven. Nothing may be added to it, or taken from it. But the Papiſts do profeſs that the Determinations of the Pope or Council may make a point (and ſo five thouſand points; for there

there is no certain number) to be *de fide* articles of faith, and neceſſary to ſalvation, though not *in ſe*, yet *quoad nos*, as to us. (And what it, is for a Law to be obligatory *in ſe*, and not *quoad nos*, is hard to underſtand.) So that the Papiſts never know when their faith is perfect and grown to its full ſtature. For ought they know a thouſand more Articles yet may be added. And yet theſe men of uncertain growing faith, have the face to perſwade men that we are mutable, and they are fixed. You ſee our ſeveral *Principles*: now to our *Practices*.

For our part, 1. We never changed our Head, our Lord, our Faith, or one Article of our Faith: if malice it ſelf be able to charge us with changing the ſmalleſt Article of our Faith, let them ſay their worſt: we change not our Rule, the holy Scriptures, nor one clauſe or ſentence of it, but endeavour the preſervation of the ſame, which at the firſt we received. In our conteſts with the Papiſts, our great offence is at their mutation from the antient Rule and way; we contend but for the faith once delivered to the Saints: *the old way* with us is the *good way*: we abhor a Religion that is new ſprung up, or is leſs than one thouſand five hundred and fifty years ſtanding at leaſt. If we change in any thing, it is but by repenting of our former changeableneſs while our Nation was Popiſh; having then changed from the Apoſtolick ſimplicity, we change from that ſinful change, and return to the antient way again. And if we have made any further changes ſince our firſt change at the Reformation, it is but a perfecting the change to Antiquity and Apoſtolick ſimplicity, which we then begun. *Rome* was not built in a day, and is not pulled down in a day. The work of Reformation is but one change, though it be not done all at one time. If we find ſome ſpots of *Romiſh* dirt upon us, that eſcaped

us

us at our first washing, it is no dangerous mutability yet to wash it off. If a man converted by saving grace be not perfectly rid of all his former sin the first day of his Conversion, should he be reproached as mutable for striving against it all his life after, and casting it off by degrees as he is able? If a man did but recover by degrees from the relicks of his disease, they will not therefore reproach him as mutable. If he sweep the dust or dirt out of his house every day, they will not say, He is mutable, and knows not where to rest. These men might as well reproach us as mutable, because we rise in the morning and do not still lie in bed; or because we go to bed at night, and do not stay up still.

But what is it that we are changeable in? We have changed none of the substance of worship: Did we baptize before, and do we not so still? Did we pray or administer the Lords Supper before, and do we not so still? What is the change? why, 1. *We before used the common Prayer book and now we do not.* 2. *Before we used prayers at the burial of the dead, which now are omitted.* 3. *Before we used the Cross and Surplice, and kneeled at the Sacrament, which are now omitted. And what then? Therefore we have changed our Religion.* Do these men think us so sottish as to place our Religion in these Circumstances? God hath bid us *Pray continually:* but he hath not told us Whether we shall use a Prayer book or not, but left that to mens necessities or conveniences to determine of. And doth a man change his Religion or Worship of God, if he either begin or cease to use a Book? If any man had so little wit or Religion, as to place their Religion in a Prayer book, its no great loss to them if they have lost their Religion, when the Prayer book is taken from them. We doubt not but Prayer books are profitable to some, and hinderances to others: some should use them, and some

should

ſhould not: but whether we uſe them, or not uſe them, is no part of our Religion at all, but a meer Accident, or common help and appurtenance. God hath not told Preachers whether they ſhall uſe any Notes for their memory in Preaching: To one it is an hinderance, to another an help. Doth a man change his Religion when he changeth a cuſtom of uſing Notes? God hath not told us what Chapter we ſhall read, or what *Pſalm* we ſhall ſing, or what Text we ſhall Preach on this day or that day. What if one age think it beſt that ſome Paſtors give Laws to all the reſt, that they ſhall read no Chapter, preach on no Text, and ſing no *Pſalm* but by their direction: and the next age think it meeter to leave it to each Miniſter, as thinking it unfit to Ordain ſuch Miniſters that have not wit enough to chooſe their Text, or Chapter, or *Pſalm* according to occaſions. Will you ſay that here is a change of Religion? Theſe outſide Hypocrites tell the world what a thing they take Religion to be, and in what they place it. What if one man uſe an hour-glaſs in preaching, and another uſe none? What if one read a Chapter with ſpectacles, and another without, or if one preach in a Pulpit, and another below: or if one preach in a white garment, and another in a black: or if one ſtand at the Sacrament, and another ſit, and another kneel? Are we therefore of ſeveral Religions? or Is this any part of the worſhip it ſelf? Do we not all now either ſtand, ſit, or kneel at the hearing of a Sermon, as we pleaſe? Do we not kneel or ſtand at Prayer as we pleaſe? Yea do not men commonly in ſinging *Pſalms* of Prayer or Praiſe to God, ſit or ſtand as they pleaſe? And what if we do ſo at the Sacrament? Is it not all one? Or doth ſtanding, kneeling or ſitting make another Religion, or any part of it? And for Marrying, Burying, Baptizing, and the reſt, we have altered no part at all of the worſhip of God;

What ignorant ſouls are theſe, that think that the uſing a Prayer-book, or praying without book, or the uſing this geſture, or that, theſe words, or thoſe words that are to the ſame ſence, doth make different Religions or Ordinances of worſhip? Theſe are tricks that none but the ignorant will be deluded with, that know not what Religion or worſhip is. They may as well ſay, if I change my Lecture-day from Thurſday to Friday, that I change my Religion or the worſhip of God. Theſe are our great changes.

Well! will you now hear whether the Papiſts or we be the greateſt *Changlings?* 1. Some *juſt changes* they have made themſelves, that they know well enough are as great as ours. It was ſo common in the antient Church to *Pray only ſtanding on every Lords day, and not to kneel at all in any part of the worſhip of that day*, that it was taken for an Univerſal Tradition, and to kneel was taken for a great ſin, and condemned by General Councils many hundred years after Chriſt; and yet the Church of *Rome*, and other Churches as well as we, have caſt off this pretended Tradition, violated this Decree of General Councils, and forſaken this Univerſal Cuſtom of the Church. And the Papiſts receive the Euchariſt *kneeling*, for all this Law and Cuſtom.

In the primitive Church, and in *Tertullians* days, a Common Feaſt of the Church was uſed with the Lords Supper, and the Sacrament taken then. But now this Cuſtom is alſo changed. It was then the Cuſtom to ſing *ex tempore in the Congregation* to Gods praiſe. But now *Rome* it ſelf hath no ſuch Cuſtom. It was once the Cuſtom to give *Infants the Lords Supper*: but now *Rome* it ſelf hath caſt off that Cuſtom. Once it was a *Canon* that *Biſhops muſt not read the books of Gentiles*, (*Concil. Carthag.* 4.) which yet *Paul* made uſe

uſe of, and the Papiſts now do too much value. Abundance ſuch changes might be mentioned, greater than ours, in which we are juſtified by the Papiſts themſelves.

2. But they have yet other kind of changes than theſe. They have changed the very *Eſſence of the Catholick Church* (in their eſteem.) They have changed the Officers, the Doctrine, the Diſcipline, the Worſhip, and what not, as though they had been born for change, to turn all upſide down.

In the Primitive times, the Church had *no Univerſal Monarch but Chriſt:* but they have ſet up a new Univerſal Monarch at *Rome.*

In the Primitive times the *Catholick Church was the Univerſality of Chriſtians:* and they have changed it to be *only the ſubjects of the Pope.*

In the Primitive times *Rome was but a particular Church*, as *Jeruſalem* and other Churches were: but they have changed it, to *be the Miſtris of all Churches.*

For many hundred years after Chriſt, the *Scripture was taken to be a ſufficient Rule of Faith:* but they have changed it to be but *part of the Rule.*

In the antient Church all *ſorts were earneſtly exhorted to read, or hear, and ſtudy the Scripture in a known tongue:* but they have changed this into a deſperate reſtraint, proclaiming it the cauſe of all Hereſies.

In the antient Church the Bread and Wine was the *Body and Blood of Chriſt Repreſentative and Relative:* but they have changed it into the *real Body and Blood.*

Heretofore there *was Bread and Wine remaining after the words of Conſecration:* but they have changed ſo, that there remaineth neither Bread nor Wine, but the qualities and quantity, without the ſubſtance, and

this must be believed, because they say it, against Scripture and Antiquity, and in despight of sense it self.

In the antient Church the *Lords Supper was administred in both kinds, Bread and Wine to all*: but they have lately changed this into one kind only to the people, denying them one half of the Sacrament.

Of old the *Lords Supper was but the Commemoration of the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, and a Sacrament of our Communion with him and his members*: but now they have changed it into a propitiatory Sacrifice for the sins of the quick and dead: and in it they adore a piece of Bread as very God, with Divine worship.

Of old, men were taught *to make daily confession of sin, and beg pardon*, and when they had done all, to confess themselves unprofitable servants: but now they are so changed, that they pretend not only to be perfect without sin, and to Merit by the Condignity of their works with God, but to supererogate and be more perfect than innocency could make them, by doing more than their duty.

Of old those things were accounted sins deserving Hell, and needing the blood of Christ for pardon, which now are changed into *venial sins*, which properly are no sins, and deserve no more than temporal punishment.

Of old the Saints had no *proper merits* to plead for themselves; and now men have some to spare for the buying of souls out of Purgatory.

Of old the Pastors of the Churches were subject to the Rulers of the Commonwealth; even *every soul, not only for wrath, but for Conscience sake* was obliged to be subject: but now all the Clergy are exempted from

secular

ſecular Judgement, and yet the ſecular power is ſubject to them: for the Pope hath power to depoſe Princes, and diſpoſſeſs them of their Dominions, and put others in their rooms, and diſſolve the bonds of Oaths and Covenants, in which the ſubjects were obliged to them, and to allow men to murder them by ſtabbing, poyſoning, *&c.* If you do not believe me, ſtay but till I come to it, and I ſhall give you yet ſome further proof.

Would you have any more of the Popiſh Changes? Why I might fill a volume with them. Should I but recite all the changes they have made in Doctrines, and all that they have made in Church-Orders, and Diſcipline, and Religious Orders and their Diſcipline, and in Worſhip, and Ceremonies, I ſhould be over tedious: Their very Liturgy or Maſs-book hath been changed, and made by changes, ſuch abundance of additions it hath had ſince the beginning of it. What changes *Sixtus* the fifth, and *Clement* the eighth made in their Bibles, I told you before, as alſo what changes they have had in the election of their Popes.

And now I am content that any impartial man be judge whether Papiſts or the Reformed Churches are the more mutable and unſetled in their Religion? and which of them is at the greater certainty, firmneſs, and immutability?

CHAP. XXIV.

Detect. 15. ANother fraud of the Papiſts, which they place not the leaſt of their confidence in, is this: *They perſwade the people that our Church and Religion is but new, of the other days invention: and that theirs is the only old Religion. And therefore they call upon us to give them a Catalogue of the profeſſors of our Religion in all ages; which they pretend we cannot do: and aſk us where our Church was before* Luther?

To this we ſhall give them once more a brief, but ſatisfactory anſwer. I. We are ſo fully aſſured that the oldeſt Religion is the beſt; (ſince the date of the Goſpel) that we are contented that our whole cauſe do ſtand or fall by this tryal. Let him be eſteemed of the true Religion, that is of the oldeſt Religion. This is the main difference between us and the Papiſts: We are for no Religion that is not as old as the days of the Apoſtles: but they are for the Novelties and Additions of Popes and Councils. Their own *Polydore Virgil de Inven. Rerum, pag.* 410. *lib.* 8. *c.* 4. calling us a Sect, doth give you a juſt deſcription of us [*Ita licentia pacta loquendi*, &c. i. e. *Having once got leave to ſpeak, that ſect did marvailouſly increaſe in a ſhort time; which is called Evangelical, becauſe they affirm that no Law is to be received which belongeth to ſalvation, but what is given by Chriſt or the Apoſtles.*] Mark what they confeſs themſelves of our Religion: And yet theſe very men have the face to charge us with Novelty; as if Chriſt and his Apoſtles were not of ſufficient Antiquity for them. *Our* main quarrel with them is, for *adding new inventions* in Religion, and

and their principal businesse against us is to defend it, and yet they call theirs the *old Religion*, and ours the *new*.

Our Argument lieth thus: *That which is most conform to the Doctrine and Practice of Christ and his Apostles, is the truly Antient Religion and Church. But our Religion and Church is most conform to the Doctrine and practice of the Apostles: therefore it is the truly antient Religion and Church.* The Major they will yield: For no older Religion is desirable, further than as the Law of Nature and Moral Determinations of God are still in force. I suppose they will not plead for Judaism. For the Minor, we lay our cause upon it, and are ready to produce our evidence for the Conformity of our Religion and Churches to the Doctrine and practice of the Apostles.

That Religion which is most conform to the Holy Scripture is most conform to the doctrine and practice of Christ and his Apostles: But our Religion (and Churches) is most conform to the Holy Scriptures: therefore, *&c.* They can say nothing against the Major, but that the Scripture is Insufficient without Tradition: But for that, 1. We have no Rule of Faith but what is by themselves confessed to be true: They acknowledge Scripture to be the true word of God; So that the Truth of our Rule is Justified by themselves. 2. Let them shew us as good Evidence that their Additional Articles of faith or Laws of life came from the Apostles, as we do that the Scriptures came from them, and then we shall confess that we come short of them: Let them take the Controversies between us point by point, and bring their proof, and we will bring ours, and let that Religion carry it that is Apostolical: But we are sure that by this means they will be proved Novelists. For 1. Their Traditions in matter of faith superadded to the Scripture,

are meer Heretical or Erroneous forgeries, and they can give us no proof that ever they were Apoſtolical. 2. The Scripture affirmeth its own ſufficiency; and therefore excludeth their Traditions. 3. I ſhewed you how in their own General Council at *Baſil*, the Scripture ſufficiency was defended. 4. I have ſhewed you in my Book called the *Safe Religion*, that the antient Fathers were for the ſufficiency of Scripture. 5. Their Traditions are the opinions of a dividing ſect, contrary to the Traditions or Doctrine of the preſent Catholick Church: the far greater part of Chriſtians being againſt them. 6. We are able to ſhew that the time was for ſome hundred years after Chriſt, when moſt of their pretended Traditions were unknown or abhorred by the Chriſtian Church, and no ſuch things were in being among them. 7. And we can prove that the chief points of Controverſie maintained againſt us, are not only without Scripture, but againſt it, and from thence we have full particular Evidence to diſprove them. If the Scriptures be true, as they confeſs them to be, then no Tradition can be Apoſtolical or true that is contrary to them: For example: The Papiſts Tradition is, that the Clergy is exempt from the Magiſtrates judgement: But the Holy Scripture ſaith [*Let every ſoul be ſubject to the higher powers*, Rom. 13. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.] The Papiſts Tradition is for ſerving *God publickly in an unknown tongue*: But the Holy Scripture is fully againſt it. Their Tradition is againſt *Lay mens reading the Scripture in a known tongue*, without ſpecial Licence from their ordinary: But Scripture and all antiquity is againſt them. The like we may ſay of many other Controverſies.

So that theſe ſeven ways we know their Traditions to be deceitful; becauſe they are 1. Unproved. 2. Againſt the ſufficiency of Scripture. 3. Againſt their own former confeſſions. 4. Againſt the conſent of the Fathers.

thers. 5. Contrary to the judgement of moſt of the Catholick Church. 6. We can prove that once the Church was without them. 7. And they are many of them contrary to expreſs Scripture.

And if Scripture will but ſhew which of us is neareſt the Doctrine and practice of the Apoſtles, then the Controverſie is ended, or in a fair way to it: For we provoke them to try the cauſe by Scripture, and they deny it: we profeſs it is the Rule and teſt of our Religion; but they appeal to another Rule and teſt. And thus you may ſee which is the *old Religion:* which will be ſomewhat fullyer cleared in that which followeth.

II. And that our Church and Religion hath been continued from the days of Chriſt till now, we prove thus. 1. From the promiſe of Chriſt, which cannot be broken. Chriſt hath promiſed in his word, that that Church and Religion which is moſt conform to the Scripture, ſhall continue to the end: But our Church and Religion is moſt conform to the Scripture: therefore Chriſt hath promiſed that it ſhall continue to the end.

2. From the event. The Chriſtian Religion and Catholick Church hath continued from the days of Chriſt till now. But ours is the Chriſtian Religion, and Catholick Church: therefore ours hath continued from the days of Chriſt till now. The Major they will grant: the Minor is proved by parts; thus. 1. That Religion which hath all the Eſſentials of Chriſtianity, and doth not deny or deſtroy any Eſſential part of it, is the Chriſtian Religion: but ſuch is ours: therefore, *&c.* 2. That Religion, which the Apoſtles were of, is the Chriſtian Religion: But ours is the ſame that the Apoſtles were of: therefore, *&c.* 3. That Religion, which is nearer the Scripture than the Romiſh Religion,

is

is certainly the Christian Religion: But so is ours: therefore, *&c.* 4. They that believe not only all that in particular that is contained in the Antient Creeds of the Church, but also in general all that is besides in the Holy Scripture, are of the Christian Religion: But thus do the Reformed Churches believe, *&c.*

2. And for our Church; 1. They that are of that one Holy Catholick Church, whereof Christ is the head, and all true Christians are members, are of the true Church: (For there is but one Catholick Church:) But so are we: therefore, *&c.*

2. They that are Sanctified, Justified, have the love of God in them, are members of the true Catholick Church: But such are all that are sincere Professors of our Religion: therefore, *&c.*

But all this will not serve them without a Catalogue, and telling them where our Church was before *Luther*: To this we further answer; we have no peculiar Catholick Church of our own; for there is but *one*, and *that is* our Church: Where-ever the Christian Church was, there was *our Church*. And where-ever any *Christians were congregate* for Gods worship, there were Churches of the same sort, as our particular Churches. And where-ever Christianity was, there our Religion was: For we know no Religion but Christianity. And would you have us give you a Catalogue of all the Christians in the world, since Christ? Or would you have us as vain as *H. T.* in his Manual, that names you some Popes, and about twenty professors of their faith in each age, as if twenty or thirty men were the Catholick Church: Or as if those men were proved to be Papists by his naming them? This is easie but silly disputing.

In a word, Our Religion is Christianity. 1. Christianity hath certain Essentials, without which no man can be a Christian; and it hath moreover many precious

cious truths, and duties neceſſary *neceſſitate præcepti*, and alſo *neceſſitate medii*, to the *better being of a Chriſtian*. Our *being* as *Chriſtians* is in the *former*; and our *ſtrength* and *increaſe* and *better being* is much in the latter. From the *former*, *Religion* and the *Church* is denominated. Moreover, 2. Our implicite and actual explicite Belief (as the Papiſts call them) muſt be diſtinguiſhed; or, our General and our particular Belief. 3. And alſo the Poſitives of our Belief muſt be diſtinguiſhed from the implyed Negatives; and the expreſs Articles themſelves, from their implyed Conſectaries.

And now premiſing theſe three diſtinctions, I ſhall tell you where our Church hath been in all Ages ſince the birth of Chriſt.

1. In the days of Chriſt and his Apoſtles our Church was where they and all Chriſtians were: And our Religion was with them in all its parts, both *Eſſential* and *perfective*. That is, we now Believe 1. All to be true that was delivered by the Apoſtles as from God, with a *General faith*. 2. We believe all the Eſſentials and as much more as we can underſtand, with a *Particular faith*. 3. But we cannot ſay that with ſuch a *particular faith* we believe all that the Apoſtles believed or delivered; for then we muſt ſay that we have the ſame degree of underſtanding as they; and that we underſtand every word of the Scriptures.

2. In the days of the Apoſtles themſelves, the *Conſectaries*, and implied Verities, and Rejections of all Hereſies were not particularly and expreſly delivered either in Scripture or Tradition (as the Papiſts will confeſs.)

3. In the next ages after the Apoſtles, *our Church was the one Catholick Church, containing all true Chriſtians, Headed by Jeſus Chriſt:* and every ſuch Chriſtian

ſtian (too many to number) was a member of it. And for our Religion, the *Eſſential* parts of it were contained both in the Holy Scriptures, and in the Publick Profeſſions, Ordinances, and Practices of the Church in thoſe ages, (which you call Traditions:) and the reſt of it, even all the Doctrines of faith and Univerſal Laws of God, which are its perfective parts, they were fully contained in the Holy Scriptures. And ſome of our Rejections and Conſectaries, were then gathered and owned by the Church, as Hereſies occaſioned the expreſſing of them: and the reſt were all implyed in the Apoſtolical Scripture Doctrine which they preſerved.

4. By degrees many errors crept into the Church: yet ſo, that 1. Neither the Catholick Church, nor one true Chriſtian (*in ſenſu compoſito* at leaſt) did reject any Eſſential part of Chriſtianity. 2. And all parts of the Church were not alike corrupted with error, but ſome more, and ſome leſs. 3. And ſtill the whole Church held the Holy Scripture it ſelf, and ſo had a perfect General or Implicite belief; even while by evil conſequences they oppugned many parts of their own profeſſion.

5. When in proceſs of time by claiming the univerſal Soveraignty, *Rome* had introduced a new pretended Catholick Church (ſo far as their opinion took) by ſuperadding a New Head and form, there was then a *twofold Church in the Weſt*; *the Chriſtian as Chriſtian* headed by Chriſt, and the *Papal as Papal* Headed by the Pope; yet ſo as they called it but *one Church*; and by this uſurped Monarchy as under Chriſt endeavoured to make but *one* of them, by making *both the Heads Eſſential*, when before *one only* was *tolerable*. And if the *Matter* in any part may be the ſame; and the ſame Man be a *Chriſtian* and a *Papiſt*, and ſo the ſame Aſſemblies:

blies: yet ſtill the *forms* are various: and *as Chriſtians* and *part of the Catholick Church*, they are one thing: and *as Papiſts*, *and members of the ſeparating ſect*, they are another thing. Till this time there is no doubt of our Churches Viſibility.

6. In this time of the Romiſh Uſurpation, our Church was viſible in three degrees, in three ſeveral ſorts of perſons. 1. It was viſible in *the loweſt degree* among the Papiſts themſelves, not *as Papiſts*, but as *Chriſtians*. For they never did to this day deny the *Scriptures*, nor the *Antient Creeds*, nor *Baptiſm*, *the Lords Supper*, nor any of the ſubſtance of our Poſitive Articles of Religion. They added a *New Religion* and Church of their own, but ſtill profeſſed to hold all the old in conſiſtency with it.

Where-ever the *truth of holy Scriptures and the antient Creeds of the Church* were profeſſed, there was our Religion before *Luther*: But even among the Papiſts the holy Scriptures and the ſaid Creeds were (viſibly) profeſſed: therefore among them was our Religion.

And note here that Popery it ſelf was not ripe for a corruption of the Chriſtian faith profeſſed, till *Luthers* oppoſition heightned them. For the Scripture was frequently before, by Papiſts held to be a moſt ſufficient Rule of faith, (as I ſhewed before from the Council of *Baſil*:) and conſequently, Tradition was only pleaded as conſervatory and expoſitory of the Scripture; but now the Council of *Trent* hath in a ſort equalled them. And this they were lately driven to, when they found that out of Scripture they were unable to confute or ſuppreſs the truth.

2. At the ſame time of the Churches oppreſſion by the Papacy, our Religion was viſible (and ſo our Church:) *in a more illuſtrious ſort*, among the *Chriſtians of the moſt of the world*, *Greeks*, *Ethiopians*, *and*

and the reſt, that never were ſubject to the uſurpation of *Rome*, but only (many of them) took him for the *Patriarch primæ ſedis*, but not *Epiſcopus Eccleſiæ Catholicæ*, or the Governour of the Univerſal Church. So that here was a viſibility of our Church doubly more eminent than among the Romaniſts: 1. In that it was *the far greateſt part* of the Catholick Church that thus held our Religion, to whom the Papiſts were then but few. 2. In that they did not only hold the *ſame Poſitive Articles of faith* with us, but alſo among their *Rejections*, did reject the *chief* of the *Popiſh errors* as we do. Beſides many particular points named in my *Safe Religion*, they rejected with us, the *Popes Catholick Monarchy*, the *pretended Infallibility of the Pope* or *his Councils*: *the new form of the Papal Catholick Church*, *as Headed by him*, with other ſuch points; which are the very fundamental Controverſies between us and the Papiſts. So that (beſides that the Papiſts themſelves profeſs our Religion) *the Major part of the Catholick Church did profeſs it*, *with the Rejection of the Papacy and Papal Church*; and ſo you may as eaſily ſee where our Religion was before *Luther*, as where the Catholick Church, or moſt of Chriſtians were before *Luther*.

3. And beſide both theſe, our Religion was profeſſed with a yet greater *Rejection* of Romiſh corruptions, by thouſands, and many thouſands that lived in the Weſtern Church it ſelf, and under the Popes noſe, and oppoſed him in many of his ill endeavours againſt the Church and truth, together with them that gave him the hearing, and were glad to be quiet, and gave way to his Tyranny, but never conſented to it.

Concerning theſe we have abundant evidence, though abundance more we might have had, if the power and ſubtilty of the Papal faction had not had the handling of them. 1. We have abundance of Hiſtories that tell us of

of the bloody wars and contentions that the Emperours both of East and West have had with the Pope to hinder his Tyranny; and that they were forced by his power to submit to him, contrary to their former free professions. 2. And we have abundance of Treatises then written against him, both for the Emperours and Princes, and against his Doctrine and Tyranny: Some store of them *Goldastus* hath gathered: And intimations of more you have in their own expurgatory Indices. 3. And we have the Histories and professions of the *Albigenses*, *Waldenses*, *Bohemians* and others that were very numerous, and if *Raynerius* say true, they affirmed (about the year one thousand one hundred) that they had continued since the Apostles, and no other Original of them is proved. 4. Particular evidence unanswerable is given in by Bishop *Usher de Succes. & statu Eccl.* and *Answer to the Jesuites* and *the Antient Religion of* Ireland, and in Dr. *Field*, and Morneys *Mysterie of Iniquity*, and *of the Church*, and *Illyricus*, and many others. 5. Even General Popish Councils have contended and born witness against the Popes superiority over a Council. 6. And in that and other points whole Countreys of their own are not yet brought over to the Pope. 7. They have still among themselves *Dominicans*, *Jansenists*, &c. that are reproached by the Jesuites as siding with *Calvin* in many Controversies, as *Catharinus* and many more in others. Most points of ours which we oppose to Popery, being maintained by some or other of them. 8. But the fullest evidence is the certain History or knowledge of the case of the common people and Clergy among them, who are partly ignorant of the main matters in Controversies between us (as we see by experience of multitudes for one, to this day) and are generally kept under the fear of fire, and sword, and torments; so that the truth of the Case is this: The

Roman

Roman Bishops were aspiring by degrees to be Archbishops, and so to be Patriarchs, and so to have the first seat and vote, and to be called the *Chief Bishops or Patriarchs*, and at last they made *another thing* of their office, and claimed (about six hundred years or more after Christ) to be *Universal Monarchs or Governours of all the Church:* But though this claim was soon laid, it was comparatively but few, even in the West, that made it any Article of their faith; but multitudes sided with the Princes that would have kept the Pope lower, and the most of the People medled not with the matter, but yielded to necessity, and gave place to violence, except such as the *Albigenses*, *Bohemians*, *Wickliffists* and the rest that more openly opposed. So that no man could judge of the multitude clearly, which side they were on, being forced by fire and sword, and having not the freedom to profess their minds.

So that in summ, our Religion was at first with the Apostles, and the Apostolick Church: and for divers hundred years after, it was with the Universal Christian Church: And since *Romes* usurpation, it was even with the Romanists though abused, and with the greater part of the Catholick Church that renounced Popery then, and so do now; and also with the opposers of the Pope in the West under his own nose. You see now what Succession we plead, and where our Church and Religion still was.

If any deny that We are of the same Church and Religion with the Greeks, Abassines, and most of the Christian world, (yea all that is truly Christian,) I easily prove it. 1. They that are Christians joyned to Christ the Head, are all of the same Church and Religion (for none else are Christians or united to Christ, but the Church which is his Body:) But the sincere Grecks, Abassines, *&c.* and we are Christians united

to

to Christ the Head : therefore we are all of one and the same Church and Religion.

2. They that believe the same Holy Scripture, and differ in no essential part of the Christian faith, are of the same Church and Religion : but so do both we and all true Christians : therefore we are all of one Church and Religion.

3. They that are truly regenerate, and Justified, hating all known sin, longing to be perfect, Loving God above all, and seeking first his Kingdom and Righteousness, and accounting all things but as dung in comparison of Christ, these are all of the true Catholick Church, and the true Christian Religion ; but such are all that are sincere, both of the Greeks, Abassines, *&c.* and the Reformed Churches ; as we prove, 1. To others by our Profession and Practice, by which only they are capable of judging of us. 2. To ourselves infallibly against all the Enemies of our salvation in Hell or Earth, by the knowledge and acquaintance with our own hearts, and the experience of the work of God upon them. All the Jesuites in the world cannot perswade me that I love not God, and hate not sin, and prefer not the Love of Christ before all the world, when I feel and know that I do ; till they can prove that they know my heart better than I do.

4. If *Christ Consent* to it, and *we Consent* to it, then we are all (that are sincere in their profession) of the true Catholick Church and Religion, (for if *he consent* and *we consent*, who is there that is able to break the match?) But Christ consenteth, and we consent : as we prove by parts. 1. *His consent* is expressed in his Gospel, that *whoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life* ; and *whoever will, may drink of the water of life freely.* 2. And *our consent* we openly professed at Baptism, and have frequently renewed,

newed, and our own ſouls are acquainted with the ſincerity of it, whatever any that know not our hearts may ſay againſt it.

5. All that are truly Baptized, and own their Baptiſmal Covenant, are viſible members of the true Catholick Church; (For it is the very nature and uſe of Baptiſm to enter us into that Church:) But Greeks, Abaſſines, Georgians, Armenians, *&c.* and Proteſtants, are all truly Baptized, and own their Baptiſmal Covenant: therefore we are all of the true Catholick Church.

What is ordinarily ſaid againſt *this ſucceſſion* of our Church, I have anſwered in my *Safe Religion.* I now add an anſwer to what another, *viz. H. Turbervile* in his *Manual*, ſaith againſt us in the preſent point. The eaſineſs of his Arguments, and the open vanity of his exceptions, will give me leave to be the ſhorter in confuting them.

His firſt Argument (*pag.* 43.) is this. [*The true Church of God hath had a continued Succeſſion from Chriſt* ——— *But the Proteſtant Church, and ſo of all other Sectaries, hath not a continued Succeſſion from Chriſt to this time: therefore*, &c.] *Anſw.* 1. I pray thee Reader be an impartial Judge what this man or any Papiſt ever ſaid with ſenſe and reaſon, to prove that the Eaſtern and Southern Churches have no true Succeſſion. Let them talk what they pleaſe of their Schiſm, the world knows they have had as good a Succeſſion as *Rome.* Are they not now of the ſame Church and Religion as ever they have been? All the change that many of them have made, hath been but in the entertaining of ſome fopperies, common to *Rome* and them. And if any of theſe (which you call Sectaries) can prove their Succeſſion, it deſtroys your Argument and Cauſe. Me thinks you ſhould not ask

ask *them*, where *their Church* was before *Luther?*

2. But how doth this Disputer prove his Minor, that *we* have no Succession? Only by a stark falshood: forsooth [*by the Concession of the most Learned Adversaries, who freely and unanimously Confess, that before* Luther *made his separation from the Church of* Rome, *for nine hundred or one thousand years together, the whole world was Catholick, & in obedience to the Pope of* Rome.]

Answ. O horrid boldness! that a man that pleads for the Sanctity of his Church, dare thus speak so notorious an untruth in the face of the world! At this rate of Disputing, the man might have saved the labour of writing his Book, and have as honestly at once have perswaded his Disciples, that his Adversaries unanimously confess that the Papists cause is best. What if the fifteen cited by him had said so, when I can bring him one thousand five hundred of another mind, and cite him fifteen for one of another mind, is that the unanimous confession of his Adversaries? But unless his Adversaries were quite beside themselves, there is not one of them could say as he feigneth them to say. For doth not the world know, that the Eastern and Southern Churches, far exceeding the Romanists in number, did deny obedience to the Pope of *Rome?* Would this perswade his poor Disciples that we all confess, that there are, or were no Christians in the world but Protestants and Papists? His first cited Confession is *Calvins* [*that all the Western Churches have defended Popery.*] A fair proof! Doth this Disputer believe in good sadness, that the *Western Churches* are *all the world*, or a sixth part of the world? But this is the Popish arguing. What *Calvin* speaks of the Western Churches, that is, the prevailing power in each Nation of them, he interprets of *all the world.* So he deals with Dr. *White*, who expressly in the words before those

which he citeth, affirmeth the visibility of the Churches of *Greece*, *Ethiope*, *Armenia*, and *Rome*; but only saith, that at all times there hath not been visible distinct companies free from all corruption: which one would think every penitent man should grant that knows the corruption of his own heart and life. It would be tedious to stand to shew his odious abuse of the rest: when they that say most, use the word [world] but as it is used, *Luk.* 2. 1. So much of his first argument.

His second is this. [*Without a continued number of Bishops, Priests, Laicks, succeeding one another in the profession of the same faith from Christ and his Apostles to this time, a continued succession cannot be had: But Protestants have no continued number*, &c.]

Answ. And how proves he the Minor? *No how at all:* but puts us to disprove it; and withal gives us certain Laws, which we will obey when they grow up to the honour of being reasonable. His first Law is, that [*We must name none but only such as held explicitely the thirty nine Articles, all granting and denying the same points that the late Protestants of* England *granted or denyed – for if they differ from them in any one material point, they cannot be esteemed Protestants.*] *Answ.* A learned Law! And what call you [*a material point?*] You may yet make what you list of it. If they differ in any point *Essential to Christianity*, we grant your imposition to be necessary. But there is not the least Chronological, or Geographical, or other truth in Scripture, but is a *Material* Point, though not *Essential.* Must you needs know which these *Essentials* are? In a word: *Those which the Apostles and the ancient Church pre-required the knowledge and profession of, unto Baptism.* And because all your fond exceptions are grounded on this one point, I shall crave your patience, while I briefly, but sufficiently prove that

Men

Men that err, and that in points material, may yet be of the same Church and Religion.

Argum. 1. If men that err in points material (that is, precious truths of God, which they ought to have believed,) may yet be *true Christians* and hold all the Essentials of Christianity: then may they be of the same true Church and Religion: But the former is true: therefore so is the later. The Antecedent is proved, in that all truths which may be called Material, are not of the essence of Christianity.

Argum. 2. The Apostle *Thomas* erred in a *Material* point (which is now an essential,) when he would not believe Christs Resurrection: and yet was a member of the true Church: therefore, *&c.*

Argum. 3. The Papists err in material points, and yet think themselves of the same true Church: therefore they must confess that differing in *Material* points may be the case of members of the same true Church. For proof of the Minor, I demand: Are none of the points *Material* that have been so hotly agitated between the Jesuites, and Dominicans and Jansenists? the Papal party, and the Council party? the Thomists, Scotists, Ockamists, *&c.* At least review the Jesuite Casuists cited by the Jansenists Mysterie of Jesuitism; and tell us whether it be no whit Material *Whether a man may kill another for a Crown? or may kill both Judge and witnesses to avoid an unjust sentence? Or whether a man should go with good meanings into a Whore house to perswade them to penitence, that hath found by experience that when he comes there he is naught with them himself? Or whether a man may lawfully lie and calumniate to put by a calumny? Or speak falsly with mental reservations? Or forbear loving God many years together, if not all his life?* Are these points no whit *Material?* You know that one part of you (with a Pope and Ge-

neral Council) are for deposing Heretical Princes, and others of you disavow it: Is this *no whit material?* And yet you are all of one Church and Religion. A hundred more of your differences I could name.

Argum. 4. From instances of the Fathers that have erred in *Material* points, and yet are taken to be of the same Church and Religion. How many Churches differed about *Easter* day? What abundance of errors are in your *Clementines*, and other such writers owned by you? *Justin Martyr* was a Millenarie: Numbered divers Infidels with Christians; thought that Angels lived by meat, and generated with Devils, *&c.* *Athenagoras* thought that second Marriages were comely Adultery, and that the Angels fell by the love of women, and begot Gyants of them, *&c.* *Irenæus* hath the like. *Theophilus Antioch.* worse. *Tertullian* and *Origen* you will confess had yet worse. *Clem. Alexand.* was for the salvation of Infidels and Heathens: against swearing; and many such besides those before mentioned. *Greg. Thaumaturgus* hath divers, if the confession and other works be his that are ascribed to him. *Cyprian*, *Firmilian*, and the whole Council at *Carthage* were for rebaptizing those baptized by Hereticks; against all Wars and Oaths. *Lactantius* (with many more) was a Millenary, and hath too many great errors. I have no delight to rake into their faults; but if it be necessary, I shall quickly prove many and great errors, by fourty more of them at the least: And yet all these or most, are confessed by you to be of one Church and Religion.

Argum. 5. From your own Confessions. *Bellarmine lib. 1. de Beat. SS. cap. 6.* saith that *He seeth not how the sentence of* Justin, Irenæus, *&c. can be defended from error.* Of *Tertullian* he saith, *There's no trust to be given to him: lib. 4. de Rom. Pont. c. 8.* Eusebius he

he saith *was addicted to the Hereticks.* Cyprian, he saith, *did seem to sin mortally: de Rom. Pont. lib. 4. cap. 7.* *Augustin* is accused by many Jesuites *for going too far from* Pelagius. *Hierom* is oft pluckt by you. And so are many more of the Fathers. And yet you confess some of them at least were of the true Church and Religion.

Argum. 6. If there be no perfect concord to be expected till we come to the place of perfect knowledge and happiness, then it is not perfect concord that is necessary to prove us of the same Church or Religion. But the Antecedent is alas too far past doubt, Therefore, *&c.*

Argum. 7. If the godly and learned Doctors of the Church (and all men) have some (alas how many) culpable errors in matters of Religion (yea of faith, if you call that *de fide*, which we are obliged to believe) then those that have such errors may be of the same Church and Religion: But the Antecedent is so true and evident that I think none but a blind proud Pharisee will deny himself to beg of God daily to pardon and heal his culpable errors. So much to prove that men of errors and differing minds (if not about the essence of the Church) may be of the same Church.

2. But why is it that they *must all needs explicitely hold the thirty nine Articles?* 1. I pray you tell us, whether all your own Church do explicitely hold and believe all your Articles? that is, all that Popes and General Councils have defined or declared. Dare you say that one of five hundred, of five thousand, doth explicitely believe all this? And why then is it necessary in our case that all must *explicitely* believe all those Articles? 2. Yea with us it is far more unnecessary. For we take not *those Articles for the Rule of our faith*, but only the Holy Scripture: And therefore you may as well

well tell us that no man is of our Religion, that did not write or speak all the same words that *Jewel*, *Reignold*, *Perkins*, or such other have written in their whole works. 3. It's easie to prove for all that, that the sense and substance of those Articles have been owned by the Churches in all ages.

3. But what if we grant your conclusion, that [*else they cannot be esteemed Protestants,*] What of that? As if none but *Protestants* were of the same Church and Religion with us. Sure you think we make a sect of our selves like you, and exclude all others from the Church and Salvation as you do! The word [*Protestant*] is not the first denomination of our Religion from its essence; for so we call our selves [*Christians*] only: But it is a title that accidentally accrewed to our Religion, from our *Protesting against your innovations and corruptions*; and our Rejecting the errors contrary to our Religion which you had introduced. Now those that were not involved in your errors, as our forefathers were, but lived at a further distance from you, might have no occasion to make such a Protestation, and yet be of the same Church and Religion as we are.

Now to your *particular* Laws. 1. Saith *H. T.* [*Let him not name the Waldenses: for they held the Real presence, that the Apostles were Lay men, that all Magistrates fall from their dignity by any mortal sin, that it is not lawful to swear*, &c. *and* Waldo *lived but in one thousand one hundred and sixty.*]

Answ. 1. We have better assurance of the faith of the Waldenses in their own published Confessions, than from the mouth of their Adversaries. 2. The Lutherans hold the real presence, and yet are of the same Religion and Church with us. 3. The Apostles were Lay-men in the Jews account and sense, as not being *Priests or Levites*, but not in the Christians account that believed

believed their miſſion: and thus thought the Waldenſes. 4. They thought that Magiſtrates and Miniſters do by Mortal ſin forfeit all the right and title to their office, from which themſelves may have comfort and juſtification in judgement: But they never thought that they were not to be obeyed by others, or that their actions were not valid for the Churches good. 5. Many of the antienteſt Fathers thought it unlawful to ſwear at all, that yet are cited by you as of your Church. But the Waldenſes are ſlandered in theſe points. 6. Though *Waldo* was but about one thouſand one hundred and ſixty, yet the ſame Religion and Church under other names, and before thoſe names were faſtned on them, was much elder, as *Raynerius* may ſatisfie you. So that for all this, the Waldenſes and we are of one Church and Religion.

He adds [*Let him not name the Huſſites; for they held Maſs, Tranſubſtantiation and ſeven Sacraments, that the Univerſal Church conſiſted only of the predeſtinate*, &c.] *Anſw.* O what a ſort of men have we to deal with? The Council of *Conſtance* burnt *John Huſs* to aſhes for ſaying that *there remained the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine after Conſecration, and that Tranſubſtantiation was a new word to deceive men with,*] as *Binnius* himſelf expreſſeth among their accuſations of him: And among the Articles for diſcovery of the Huſſites, one was [*Whether they take it to be a mortal ſin to reject the Sacraments of Confirmation extream unction and marriage?*] And yet now *Huſs* is burnt for it, the poor lay-Papiſts are perſwaded by their deceivers, that the Huſſites were for Tranſubſtantiation and ſeven Sacraments. Why then did a General Council accuſe or receive accuſation and witneſs againſt him for the contrary? 2. That the Univerſal Church is inviſible, and as taken in the firſt ſignification, containeth none

but

but the truly sanctified (and so predestinate,) we believe as well as *Huß*: though in the second Analogical signification, the Church as visible, containeth all the Professors of faith and Holiness, whether sincere or not. 3. And that they were condemned by the Council of *Constance*, and *Huß* and *Hierom* burnt after they had a safe conduct, doth shew that the faith of Papists is perfidiousness, (for why should the people be more just than a General Council?) but it shews not that we and they are not of the same Church or Religion: You condemned and burnt those of our Religion too: therefore you thought at least that we are near kin.

But *H. T.* proceeds with his precepts [*Let him not name the Albigenses: for they held all marriages to be unlawful, and all things begotten* ex coitu *to be unclean; they held two Gods*, &c.] *Answ.* These are not only such falshoods by which you uphold your cause, but the more inexcusable and shameless, by how much the more frequently and fully detected long ago, and yet continued in. *Perrin*, *Vignerius* and many others might have prevented your error: especially Bishop *Usher de Succes. Eccles. cap.* 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. who hath given you enough out of your own writers to have satisfied you; and shewed you, that it was from the Arians and Manichees, inhabiting those Countreys among them, that the heavy charges of *Bernard*, *Eckbertus Schonaugiensis* and others were occasioned. And see by him there cited what the same *Bernard* saith against your Church of *Rome*, and then judge which he spoke hardlier of.

As for the *Cathariſts* next added, they were not the Puritan Waldenses as you speak, but part of the Manichees: and if such, as they are described, we are content to lose their names, and are not ambitious to be reputed their Successors.

He

He adds [*Let him not name the Wicklifians : for they held, that all things came to paſs by fatal neceſſity ; That Princes and Magiſtrates fell from their dignity and power by mortal ſin.*] *Anſw.* We know by many of *Wicklifs* own Books Printed and Manuſcript what his judgement was, what ever your Council at *Conſtance* accuſe him of. It was a *Divine Neceſſity* oppoſed to *uncertainty*, and to the *determination of an unruled will*, that he mentioneth. And do not your Jeſuites lay as heavy a charge on the Dominicans ſometimes ? and with as great cauſe may many of your Schoolmen be diſclaimed for this as *Wicklife*, if you will underſtand him, and them. *Wicklife* was known to *obey* and *teach obedience* to Magiſtrates. But is it not a fine world, when *Wicklife* muſt not be of our Church becauſe he is ſuppoſed to deny the power of Magiſtrates in mortal ſin ? and yet the Pope and his Council determine that Princes or Lords that will not root out ſuch as the Pope calls Hereticks muſt be caſt out, and their Countrey given to others. It ſeems you take *Wicklife* to be ſome kin to your ſelves. But we doubt not but he was of the Catholick Church and Religion, and therefore of the ſame with us.

H. T. Adds [*Let him not name the Grecians : for they rejected the Communion of Proteſtants.* Cenſur. Eccl. Orient. *They were at leaſt ſeven hundred or eight hundred year in Communion with the Church of* Rome. —— *They were united to the Church of* Rome *again in the Council of* Florence : *They held Tranſubſtantiation, ſeven Sacraments, unbloody Sacrifice, Prayer to Saints, and for the dead.*]

Anſw. If one Patriarch, or twenty men reject our Communion, what's that to the Millions of Greek Chriſtians that never rejected it ? And what's that to all Patriarchs before and after that rejected it not ? Did *Cyril* reject our Communion, that hath publiſhed a Proteſtant confeſſion,

confeſſion, and was ſo maligned and treacherouſly dealt with to the death, and falſly accuſed to the Turks by the Jeſuites for his conſtancy? 2. Do you think the world knoweth not by what inducements you drew a few poor men at *Florence* to ſubſcribe to a certain union with you? and what death the Patriarch dyed? and how the Greeks reſented his fact? and what a return they made to your Church? I pray perſwade your ſelves that they and we and all are Papiſts. 3. If the Greeks did diſclaim Communion with us, they are nevertheleſs of the ſame Church and Religion with us, for all that. *Paul* and *Barnabas* were both Chriſtians when they parted in diſſention. If one neighbour in anger call another Traitor unjuſtly, and ſay he will have no Society with him, they may be both the Kings ſubjects and members of one Common-wealth for all that. 4. As to the Greeks opinions, and the Papiſts falſe accuſations of them, I have ſpoken already againſt pretended *Veridicus* in my *Safe Religion*. It is not you nor all the Jeſuites on earth that can prove the Greeks and us to be ſo diſtant, as not to be of the ſame Catholick Religion and Church.

You add [*Let him not name the Egyptians: for they held Tranſubſtantiation and unbloody Sacrifice, as is manifeſt by their Liturgies; but denyed the proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Son, and held but one will in Chriſt.* Godignus de reb. Abaſ. lib. 1. cap. 28.]

Anſw. 1. *Godignus* talks not of the *Egyptians* but the *Abaſſines*. This learned man it ſeems, is ſo homebred, and confined to the *Roman* Church, that he little regardeth the reſt of the Chriſtian world; or elſe he would have known a difference between the *Egyptians* and *Abaſſines*: He is likely to know well the true Catholick Church that while. 2. You cannot prove that they hold Tranſubſtantiation. Nor ſhall your bare naming

ming their Liturgy make us believe it. The *Egyptian* Liturgy you tell us not where to find, nor I ſuppoſe do you know your ſelves. An *Ethiopick* Liturgy your compilers of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* have given us, *Tom.* 6. But 1. It hath no mention of Tranſubſtantiation in it, that I can find, but only a *Hoc eſt Corpus*, &c. which we ſay in our Adminiſtration as well as they. 2. And I find that Liturgy ſo contrary to the reports of your own writers concerning the practice of the Ethiopians, (as about the Elevation, Confirmation, *&c.*) that I muſt needs conclude, that either the Liturgy or much of it is forged, or that the generality of your own Relators of their practice are groſly deceived, and do deceive, (which is not likely, becauſe they are many, and write at ſeveral times, and it is againſt themſelves.) 3. And as for the *proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt*, and the *denyal of two wills in Chriſt*, ſome of your own writers profeſs, that the former in the Greeks, and the later in many others, is found to be but a verbal difference, the ſame words not ſignifying the ſame thing in their eſteem as in ours. 4. However, if they would but become the ſubjects of the Pope, they might be of your Church for all this: and therefore ſeeing they are the ſubjects of Chriſt, we ſhall take both Ethiopians and Copties to be of the ſame Catholick Church with *us*, for all theſe and many other of their errors.

Laſtly ſaith *H. T.* [*Let him not cite the Armenians: for they hold but one nature in Chriſt, and that his fleſh was changed into his Divinity, and were condemned by the Council of* Calcedon.]

Anſw. The Armenians are a conſiderable part of the Catholick Church. *Binnius* in the life of *Eugenius* the third ſaith, Their Catholick (ſo call they their chief Biſhop) hath *infinite*, that is, *above a thouſand Biſhops under him*. *Oth. Friſingenſis* hath the like.

1. Though

1. Though they held but one nature in Christ, it was not by permixtion or confusion of the natures, as *Eutyches* imagined, but Conjunction or Coalition: *Nicephor. Hist. Eccles. lib.* 18. *cap.* 53. And divers of your own writers say, the difference is found to be but in words. And even all this they now deny, as you may see in their own Confession published not eighty years ago, *Artic.* 26. 27, 28, 29, 30. &c. 2. That they change the humane nature of Christ into the Divinity, is your slander, and therefore no good argument. 3. That they were condemned by (the fifth Act, or in any Act of) the Council of *Calcedon*, is another untruth: Sure you go much upon truth, that dare venture to stuff your Book with such falshoods. But the best is, your simple Papists know not but all is true: They must believe you, and cannot disprove you. The Armenians then, and we are of one Catholick Church and Religion, notwithstanding all your forgeries and vain exceptions. I know that one or two petty Councils chid them for mixing water with wine in the Eucharist; and more than that, the Canons of the General Council called *Quinisexti* do condemn the same error as theirs, and also their deputing the Sons of Priests successively to the Priesthood, and not shaving their hair: and their eating eggs and cheese on Saturdayes and Sundayes in Lent. But 1. We fear not to say that we are of the same Church with men that err more than not shaving, or than eating eggs and cheese comes to, or any of this. 2. And remember that this is one of your Reprobate Councils. 3. And one that the third time (when two General Councils before had done it) did *Canon.* 36. give *æqualia privilegia*, equal priviledges to the Seat of *Constantinople* as *Rome* had. So that I think you will have no mind of this General Council. And if any other have judged them Eutychians, though I renounce that

that opinion, yet I muſt tell you, that my Charity covereth far greater errors in the Papiſts, or elſe I could not take them for Chriſtians. If the Queſtion had ever been ſtarted in a Council, *Whether mans ſoul and body are two Natures or but one*, it's ten to one but it would have made another hereſie: and yet perhaps the real difference have been no more than it is now there is no Controverſie about it.

But *H. T.* addeth [*Proteſtants pretence to the Fathers of the firſt five hundred years, is very idle; becauſe were it true, as it is moſt falſe, that thoſe Fathers were Proteſtants, yet could not that ſuffice to prove them a continued Succeſſion of one thouſand ſix hundred years.*]

Anſw. 1. It ſufficeth us if thoſe Fathers were *Chriſtians*, as we are, though having no Uſurper of an univerſal Monarchy to *Proteſt* againſt, they were not to be called Proteſtants. 2. It is an idle pretence indeed, to go about to prove a Succeſſion of one thouſand ſix hundred years, by the bare inſtance of five hundred years: but your idle head hath forged more idle pretences than this, by way of calumniation. But yet we may prove the *Antiquity* of *our* Religion from thoſe Fathers, and the *Novelty* of *yours*, and a Succeſſion for thoſe five hundred years: and for the *reſt*, if the whole Chriſtian world had been big enough for you to ſee, you might have diſcerned our Evidence of a further Succeſſion.

He adds [2. *Becauſe thoſe of the ſixth age muſt needs know what was the Religion and Tenets of them that lived in the fifth age, by whom they were inſtructed, and with whom they daily converſed, better than our Proteſtants can now do; who have Proteſted on their ſalvation, that it was the very ſame with theirs, received from them by word of mouth*, &c.]

Anſw. 1. Any thing will ſerve for the ſimple that will

will believe you. But I pray you tell us whether it were all or some of the sixth age that made this solemn Protestation that you mention. If all, or most, or the ten thousandth man, tell us where we may find that Protestation. If a few, they were not the *sixth age*. 2. If Pope *Boniface* alone was not the sixth age, tell us where that age did Protest on their salvation, that the Bishop of *Rome* was taken by their Fore-fathers for the universal Monarch and Head of the Church (beyond his bare Primacy of order.) 3. What age hath protested on their salvation, that the Roman prohibition of reading Scriptures, or of receiving the Eucharist in both kinds, or other points anon to be mentioned, were the Religion of their Fore-fathers, and so from age to age? 4. I pray you tell us where to find this Protestation of the tenth age, which *Genebrard*, *Bellarmine*, and others of your own so complain of, as having not learned men, nor any Council, but Apostatical Popes and an ignorant wicked Clergy, that suspected a man of Heresie if he understood Greek or Hebrew, and of Magick or Conjuring if he medled with Mathematicks? 5. It is legible in the writings of the sixth Age, that they did fetch the Doctrine of the fifth age from their *writings*, and not only from word of mouth. What else mean the preservation of those writings and those numerous citations out of them? Nay more; they would not trust their *memories in a General Council for the Canons of the Church:* no nor for the Canons of the next preceding Council, no nor for the Common Creed; but had all read and repeated out of the writing before the Council when there was occasion. And let Conscience be free to speak truth for a few sentences, and tell us in good sadness, whether you believe that the Oral Tradition of all the Church did preserve the Knowledge of *Augustins*, *Epiphanius*, *Chrysostoms*, &c. Doctrine, so much

much as their writings do? Is the Doctrine of *Aquinas*, *Scotus*, *Gabriel*, &c. yea the Council of *Trent* preſerved now more certainly in mens memories, than in writing? If ſo, they have better memories than mine that keep them, and they have better hap than I that light of ſuch keepers. For I can ſcarce tell how to deliver my mind ſo, in any difficult point, but one or other is miſunderſtanding and miſreporting it; and by leaving out or changing a word, perhaps make it another matter: ſo that I am forced to refer them to my writings: and yet there by neglect they miſinterpret me, till I open the Book it ſelf to them.

6. Either the Fathers of the fifth age are intelligible in their writings, or not. If they be, then we may underſtand them I hope with induſtry. If they be not, then, 1. Much leſs were their tranſient ſpeeches intelligible. 2. And then the writings of the ſixth age be not intelligible, nor of any other: and ſo we cannot underſtand the Council of *Trent* (as the Papiſts do not that controvert its ſenſe voluminouſly,) nor can we know the Churches judgement.

7. By your leave, the *Roman* Corrupters take on them ſo much Power to make new Laws and new Articles of Faith *quoad nos*, by definitions, and to diſpenſe with former Laws, that unleſs they are all Knights of the Poſt, they can never ſwear that they had all that they have from their Fore-fathers.

8. Well! but all this is the leaſt part of my anſwer. But I grant you that the ſixth age underſtood and retained the Doctrine of the fifth age, and have delivered it to us. But that there were no Hereticks or Corrupters, you will not ſay your ſelves. Well then! the far greateſt part of the Catholick Church did not only receive from the fifth age the ſame Chriſtian Religion, but alſo kept themſelves from the groſſeſt cor-

ruptions of the Pope and his flatterers, that were then but a ſmall part: And thus we ſtick to the Catholick Church ſucceeding to this day, and you to an Uſurper that then was newly ſet on the Throne of univerſal Soveraignty. So that your chief Argument treadeth Popery in the dirt, becauſe the greater part of the Catholick Church not only in the fifth and ſixth age, but in the ſeventh, eighth, nineth, tenth, thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth and ſixteenth ages, have been aliens or enemies to the *Roman* Univerſal Monarchy: therefore if one age of the Church knew the mind of the former age, better than the Pope did, we may be ſure that the Pope is an Uſurper.

The Third Argument of *H. T.* is, that *the Fathers of the firſt five hundred years taught their Tenets: therefore its impoſſible they ſhould be for the Proteſtants.* *Anſw.* 1. Proteſtants are Chriſtians, taking the Holy Scriptures for the Rule of their faith. If the Fathers were Chriſtians, they were for the Proteſtants: but its certain they were Chriſtians. If you could prove that they were for ſome of your miſtakes, that would not prove them againſt the Proteſtants in the Doctrine of Chriſtianity and the Holy Scriptures; and ſo, that we are not their Succeſſors in Chriſtianity, and of the ſame Church: which was it that you ſhould have proved, but forgot the queſtion. And of this we ſhall ſpeak to you more anon.

Well! by this time I have ſufficiently ſhewed the ſucceſſion of our Church, and continuation of our Religion from the Apoſtles, and where it was before *Luther*, and given you the Catholick Church inſtead of a dozen or twenty names in each age, which it ſeems will ſatisfie a Papiſt; but yet we have not done with them, but require this following Juſtice at their hands.

Seeing the Papiſts do ſo importunately call to us for Cata-

Catalogues and proof of our ſucceſſion, Reaſon and Juſtice requireth that they firſt give us a Catalogue of Papiſts in all ages, and prove the ſucceſſion of their *Roman* Catholick Church: which they can never do while they are men.

And here I muſt take notice of the deluſory ridiculous Catalogue wherewith *H. T.* begins his *Manual*. His Argument runs thus [*That is the only true Church of God, which hath had a continued ſucceſſion from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, to this day*, (very true:) *But the Church now in Communion with the Sea of* Rome *and no other, hath had a continued ſucceſſion from Chriſt and his Apoſtles to this time: therefore*, &c. —] For the proof of the Minor he giveth us a Catalogue. And here note the miſery of poor ſouls that depend on theſe men, that are deluded with ſuch ſtuff, that one would think they ſhould be aſhamed the world ſhould ſee from them.

1. What if his Catalogue were true and proved, would it prove the Excluſion, that [*no other Church*] had a ſucceſſion? Doth it prove that *Conſtantinople*, or *Alexandria* had no ſuch ſucceſſion, becauſe the Romaniſts had it? Where is there ever a word here under this Argument to prove that excluſive part of his Minor?

2. And note how he puts that for the Queſtion that is not the Queſtion between us. A fair beginning! The Queſtion is not about Churches *in Communion with you*, but about Churches *in ſubjection to you*: But this is but a pious fraud, to ſave men by deceiving them. The Antient Church of *Rome* had the Church of *Hieruſalem*, *Corinth*, *Philippi*, *Epheſus*, and many a hundred Churches in Communion with her, that never were in ſubjection to her.

3. And if the Papiſts can but prove themſelves true

Christians, I will quickly prove that the Protestants are in Communion with them still, as Christians, by the same Head (Christ,) the same spirit, baptism, faith, love, hope, &c. though not as Papists, by subjection to the same Usurper.

4. Our question is of the *Universal Church*: And this man nameth us twenty or thirty men in an age that he saith were professors of their Religion: And doth he believe in good sadness that twenty or thirty men are either the universal Church, or a sufficient proof that it was of their mind?

5. But principally, did this man think that all, or any, besides their subjects, had their wits so far to seek, as to believe that the persons named in his Catalogue were Papists, without any proof in the world, but meerly because they are listed here by *H. T.*? Or might he not to as good purpose have saved his labour, and said nothing of them?

6. But what need we go any further? We will begin with him at his first Century, and so to the second; and if he can prove that Jesus Christ, or the Virgin *Mary*, or *John Baptist*, or the Apostles, or any one of the rest that he hath named, were Papists, (much more all of them,) I am resolved presently to turn Papist. But unless the man intended to provoke his reader to an unreverent laughter about this abuse of holy things, one would think he should not have named *John Baptist*, that was dead not only before *Rome* had a Church, but also before the time that *Bellarmine* and his Brethren pretend that *Peter* received his Commission, to be the universal Head. And did not this Writer know that Protestants can give him the same names, as for them? And if printing them be proof, their proof is as good: If it be not, what proof shall we have? Our proof is the Holy Scriptures, written by the Inspiration of the Holy

Holy Ghoſt in thoſe times. Thence we prove that the firſt Church held the ſame belief as we have. Yea, though it be not incumbent on us, we will thence prove that the Catholick Church was not then Papiſts. Why elſe do we ſtill appeal to Scriptures, and they refuſe to ſtand to the tryal of it any otherwiſe than as expounded by the Pope, but that we are confident; and they diffident of them? We know the Apoſtles faith from the Apoſtles; but the Papiſts will not know it but from the preſent Church of *Rome*. They tell you the Apoſtles were for them: but how know we that? Why by the Teſtimony of the next age: and where is that Teſtimony? Why the third age received it; and how is that proved? Why becauſe the fourth age was of their mind; and how prove you that? Why in the upſhot, becauſe the preſent age is of their mind: Why but moſt Chriſtians of the preſent age, are againſt them. Yea, but they are none of the Church: it is only the preſent Church of *Rome*. Well! but the preſent Church of *Rome* repreſented in a General Council may err. I, but the Pope cannot *in Cathedra*, and in approving a Council. So that the ſumm is this: If the Pope himſelf may be judge, the Apoſtles were Papiſts: But if the Apoſtles may be heard themſelves, they were none.

I make no doubt (though *Bellarmine* deny it,) but other Churches can prove as good a ſucceſſion as the *Roman*, as to Biſhops; And poor *Bellarmine* after all is fain to give up this Mark as inſufficient to prove a true Church. *Lib.* 3. *de Eccleſ. cap.* 8. *Dico ſecundo, Argumentum a ſucceſſione legitima adferri à nobis præcipue ad probandum non eſſe Eccleſiam ubi non eſt hæc ſucceſſio, quod quidem evidens eſt: ex quo tamen non colligitur neceſſario, ibi eſſe Eccleſiam ubi eſt ſucceſſio.* By his own confeſſion then, ſucceſſion will not prove the Romaniſts a true Church.

But as to a succession of Religion, and a continuation of the Catholick Church, for my part, I am so far from declining it, in argumentation, that I here solemnly profess to all the Papists, that shall read these words, that, AS SOON AS I SHALL SEE ANY CERTAIN PROOF, BY CATALOGUE OR ANY OTHER WAY, THAT THE CATHOLICK CHURCH HATH SUCCESSIVELY FROM AGE TO AGE BEEN PAPISTS, I WILL TURN PAPIST WITHOUT DELAY: AND I CHALLENGE THEM TO GIVE US SUCH PROOF IF THEY CAN.

Nay if they will prove that in the first age alone, or the second, or third alone, the Catholick Church were Papists, I am resolved to turn Papist: Nay I am most confident they cannot prove that in any one age to this day, the Catholick Church were Papists.

And as to *H. T's.* Catologue, I return him further answer, that no one named by him in the first age had any one of their errors: And no one named by him to the year four hundred, (I may add, to the year six hundred, if his false Catalogue be truly corrected) was a Papist. So well hath he proved the Popish Succession.

But for the plainer opening of this, I shall add the discussion of another of their deceits,

CHAP.

CHAP. XXV.

Detect. 6. ANother notable fraud of the Papiſts, is, *to confound all their own errors and corruptions together, and then to inſtance in ſome of thoſe errors that are common to them with ſome others, and to omit the Eſſential parts of Popery:* And ſo they would make the world believe, that if they prove the Antiquity of any points in difference between them and us, they do thereby prove the antiquity of Popery (and ſo of the ſucceſſion:) And ſo they would make our Religion alſo Eſſentially to conſiſt in every inferiour difference between us.

Suffer them not therefore thus to juggle in the dark, but diſtinguiſh between the Eſſentials of Popery, or the main difference between them and us, and the other errors, which are not proper to them alone.

Thus *Bellarmine* opens his jugling *lib.* 4. *de Eccleſ. cap.* 9. where he pleadeth Antiquity of Doctrine as a Note of the true Church: And (ſaith he) *Jam duobus modis*, &c. *Two wayes we may by this Mark prove our Church.* 1. *By ſhewing the ſentences of the Antients, by which we confirm all our tenets, and refute our adverſaries. But this way* (ſaith he) *is moſt prolix, and obnoxious to many calumnies and objections*: (Mark Papiſts, and take heed of appealing to Antiquity.) *The other way* (ſaith he) *is ſhorter and ſurer, by ſhewing firſt from the confeſſion of the adverſaries, that our tenets are the Doctrine of all the antients*, &c.] And indeed if the weakneſs or raſhneſs of any Proteſtants be the Papiſts ſtrength, it's time for us to be more prudent: but if it be the Papiſts unhappineſs

that cannot understand the antients in the antients, but only from the Pope or the Protestants, the Fathers are faln into the hands of Babies as well as the Scriptures; and the Protestants have too little wit if they will join with the Pope in an abusive interpreting the Fathers for the Papists. And thus *Bellarmine* proceeds to cite *Calvin*, and the Centurists, as giving them the Fathers. But wherein? Forsooth in the point of *Free-will*, *Limbus*, *Concupiscence*, *Lent*, *Lay baptism in necessity*, &c. And therefore by our Confessions Antiquity is for the Papists. And this is their shortest and surest way. (The more fools we then.) Is not here great diffidence in the Fathers, when they have more confidence in our sayings than their writings?

But this jugling will not serve the turn. Take up the Essentials of Popery, and prove a Catholick succession of them, and you shall win the day. In Explication of my former professions, I here again solemnly promise and protest, that [WHEN EVER I SEE A VALID PROOF OF A CATHOLICK SUCCESSION OF THESE FOLLOWING POINTS, I WILL PRESENTLY TURN PAPIST: OR OF ANY ONE OF THEM, I WILL TAKE UP THAT ONE.] And I provoke the Papists that boast of Tradition, Succession and Antiquity, to do this if they are able.

1. Let them prove a Catholick Succession, or continuation of this point, that *The Pope of* Rome *is appointed by Christ to be the universal Monarch, Soveraign, Governour, Head of the Catholick Church, and the Vicar of Christ on earth, and holding the place of God himself, whom all must obey.*

2. *And that the true and only Catholick Church is a Society thus headed and Governed by the Pope, and*

and that no man is a true member of the Catholick Church, that is not the subject of the Pope as universal Monarch: Nor can any other be saved, as being without the Church.

3. *And that the Church of* Rome *is by Gods appointment the Mistris of all other Churches.*

4. *And that the Pope of* Rome *is Infallible.*

5. *That we cannot believe the Scriptures to be the word of God, or the Christian Doctrine to be true, but upon the Authoritative Tradition of the Roman Church, and upon the knowledge or belief of their Infallibility: that is, we must believe in the Pope as Infallible, before we can believe in Christ (who is pretended to give him that infallibility.)*

6. *That no Scripture is by any man to be interpreted but according to the sense of the Pope or Roman Church, and the unanimous consent of the Fathers.*

7. *That a General Council approved by the Pope cannot err; but a General Council not approved by the Pope may err.*

8. *That nothing is to us an Article of faith till it be declared by the Pope or a General Council; (though it was long before declared by Christ or his Apostles as plain as they can speak.)*

9. *That a General Council hath no more validity than the Pope giveth it.*

10. *That no Pastor hath a valid Ordination, unless it be derived from the Pope.*

11. *That there are Articles of faith of Necessity to our Salvation, which are not contained in the Holy Scriptures, nor can be proved by them.*

12. *That such Traditions are to be received with equal pious affection and reverence as the holy Scriptures.*

13. *That Images have equal honour with the Holy Gospel.*

14. *That*

14. *That the Clergy of the Catholick Church ought to swear obedience to the Pope as Christs Vicar.*

15. *That the Pope should be a temporal Prince.*

16. *That the Pope and his Clergy ought to be exempted from the Government of Princes, and Princes ought not to judge and punish the Clergy, till the Pope deliver them to their power, having degraded them.*

17. *That the Pope may dispossess Princes of their Dominions, and give them to others, if these Princes be such as he judgeth Hereticks, or will not exterminate Hereticks.*

18. *That in such cases the Pope may discharge all the subjects from their allegiance and fidelity.*

19. *That the Pope in his own Territories, and Princes in theirs, must burn or otherwise put to death, all that deny Transubstantiation, the Popes Soveraignty, or such Doctrines as are afore expressed, when the Pope hath sentenced them.*

20. *That the people should ordinarily be forbidden to read the Scripture in a known tongue; except some few that have a licence from the Ordinary.*

21. *That publick Prayers, Prayses and other publick worship of God, should be performed constantly in a language not understood by the People; or only in Latine, Greek or Hebrew.*

22. *That the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, is Transubstantiate into the very body and blood of Christ; so that it is no more true Bread or Wine, though our eyes, taste, and feeling tell us that it is.*

23. *That the consecrated host is to be worshipped with Divine worship, and called our Lord God.*

24. *That the Pope may oblige the people to receive the Eucharist only in one kind, and forbid them the Cup.*

25. *That the sins called venial by the Papists, are properly no sins, and deserve no more but temporal punishment.*

26. *That*

26. *That we may be perfect in this life by this double perfection,* 1. *To have no sin, but to keep all Gods Law perfectly.* 2. *To supererogate, by doing more than is our Duty.*

27. *That our works properly merit salvation of God, by way of Commutative Justice, or by the Condignity of the works as proportioned to the Reward.*

28 *That Priests should generally be forbidden Marriage.*

29. *That there is a fire called Purgatory, where souls are tormented, and where sin is pardoned, in another world.*

30. *That in Baptism there is an implicite vow of obedience to the Pope of* Rome.

31. *That God is ordinarily to be worshipped by the Oblation of a true proper propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, where the Priest only shall eat and drink the body and blood of Christ, while the Congregation look on and partake not.*

32. *That the Canon of Scripture is the same that is declared by the Council of* Trent.

I will pass by abundance more to avoid tediousness; And I will not stay to enquire which of these are proper to the Papists. But I am resolved to receive as many of them, as they can prove a Catholick succession of; that is, that they were in all ages the Doctrine of the Universal Church. And I crave the charity of such a proof from some Papist or other, if they have any charity in them; and that they will no longer keep universal Tradition in their purses.

And I would desire *H. T.* to revise his Catalogue, and instead of twenty or thirty dead and silent names, that signifie no more than Blanks or Cyphers, he would prove that both those persons and the Catholick Church did in every age hold these thirty two forementioned Doctrines.

Doctrines. And when he hath done, then let him boast of his Catalogue. Till they will perform this task, let them never more for shame call to us for Catalogues or proof of succession. But if they are so unkind that they will not give us any proof of such a Catholick succession of Popery, we shall be ready to supererogate, and give them full proof of the Negative, [*That there hath been no such succession of these thirty two points,*] as soon as we can perceive that they will ingenuously entertain it: though indeed it hath been often done already.

But certainly it belongeth to them that superinduce more Articles of Faith, to prove the continuation of their own Articles through all ages; of which anon.

Well! but one of these Articles at least (*the Pope's Soveraignty*) *H. T.* will prove successively, if you will be credulous enough. In the first age he proves it from *Peters* words, *Act.* 15. 7, 8, 9, 10. *God chose* Peter *to convert* Cornelius *and his company: therefore the Pope is the Universal Monarch.* Are you not all convinced by this admirable argument? But he forgot that *Bellarmine*, *Ragusius* (*in Concil. Basil.*) and others of them say, that *no Article can be proved from Scripture, but from the proper literal sence.* To say somewhat more, he unseasonably talks of the Council of *Sardis* and *Chalcedon*, *an.* 400. & 451 lest the first age have but a blank page.

In the second age he hath nothing but the names of a few that never dreamt of Popery, and a Canon (which you must believe was the Apostles) *that Priests must communicate.* Of which we are well content.

In the third Age he nameth fifteen Bishops of *Rome*, of whom the last was deposed for offering incense to *Saturn*, *Jupiter*, &c. But not a syllable to prove that one of these Bishops was the Universal Monarch: Much less that

that the Catholick Church was for such Monarchy. But to excuse the matter, he tells you, that *the second and third Age produced no Councils* (the greater deceivers then are the Papists that have found us Councils then;) and so you have no Catholick succession proved. *Yea, but,* he saith, *they have successions of Popes, Martyrs and Confessors, which is sufficient for their purposes.* See the strength of Popery! Any thing is sufficient for your purposes, it seems. *Rome* had Bishops, therefore they were the Universal Rulers of the Church: A strong consequence! *Rome* had Martyrs and Confessors: therefore it was the Mistris of all Churches. Who can resist these arguments? But why did you not prove that your Confessors and Martyrs suffered for attesting the Popes Soveraignty? If they suffered but for Christianity, that will prove them but Christians, and not Papists. Thus you see to the confusion of the Papists, that they have nothing to shew for the succession or antiquity of Popery for the three first Ages. Yea worse than nothing: For here he comes in with some of the Decretals forsooth of some of their Bishops. Decretals unknown, till a while ago in the world: Brought out by *Isidore Mercator:* but with so little cunning as left them naked to the shame of the world; the falshood of them being out of themselves fully proved, by *Blondell, Reignolds,* and many more, and confessed by some of themselves. Here you see the first foundation of Papal succession, even a bundle of fictions, lately fetcht from whence they please to cheat the ignorant part of the world.

But in the fourth and fifth ages *H. T.* doth make us amends for his want of proof from the three first. But suppose he do, what's that to a succession, while the three first ages are strangers to Popery? Well! but let's hear what he hath at last. His first proof (after a few

file it

ſilent names) is from *the Council of Nice*; And what ſaith that? Why 1. *It defined that the Son of God is conſubſtantial to his Father, and true God.* And what's that to Popery? 2. *But it defined the Popes Soveraignty*: But how prove you that? Why it is in the thirty ninth *Arab. Canon.* O what Conſciences have thoſe men that dare thus abuſe and cheat the ignorant! As if the Canons of the firſt General Council had never been known to the world, till the other day that *Alphonſus Piſanus* a Jeſuite publiſheth them out of Pope *Julius*, and I know not what Arabick book. Theſe men that can make both Councils and Canons at their pleaſure above a thouſand years after the ſuppoſed time of their exiſtence, do never need to want authority. And indeed this is a cheaper way of Canon-making in a corner, than to trouble all the Biſhops in the world with a great deal of coſt and travail to make them. But if this be the foundation, the building is anſwerable. Their Biſhop *Zoſimus* had not been acquainted with theſe new Articles of an old Council, when he put his trick upon the ſixth Council of *Carthage*, where for the advancement of his power (though not to an univerſal Monarchy, yet to a preparative degree) he layeth his claim from the Council of *Nice*, as ſaying [*Placuit ut ſi Epiſcopus accuſatus fuerit*, &c.] which was, that *If an ejected Biſhop appeal to* Rome, *the Biſhop of* Rome *appoint ſome of the next province to judge; or if yet he deſire his cauſe to be heard, the Biſhop of* Rome *ſhall appoint a Presbyter his Legate*, &c.] In this Council were 217 Biſhops, *Aurelius* being Preſident and *Auguſtine* being one. They told the Pope that they would not yield to him till the true copies of the Council of *Nice* were ſearched; for thoſe that they had ſeen had none of them thoſe words in, that *Zoſimus* alledged. Hereupon they ſent abroad to the Churches of the Eaſt, to *Conſtan-*

ſtantinople, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, &c. for the ancient Canons. From hence they received ſeveral copies, which all agreed; but none of them had either *Zoſimus* forgery in, nor the forged clauſe which *Bellarmine* muſt have in; much leſs the eighty Canons of *Piſanus* the Jeſuite, or this one which *H. T.* doth found his ſucceſſion on: but only the twenty Canons there mentioned, which have not a word for the Popes Soveraignty.

And here note 1. That *Zoſimus* knew not then of *Piſanus* Canons, or elſe he would have alledged them; nor yet of *Bellarmines* new part of a Canon for the Primacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*. 2. That *Zoſimus* himſelf had not the faith, the wit or the memory, to plead either Scripture, Apoſtolical Inſtitution, or Tradition, for his priviledge; but only a falſe Canon of the Council of *Nice*: as looking no higher it ſeems for his authority. 3. How early the *Roman* Biſhops begun both to aſpire, and make uſe of forgeries to accompliſh it. 4. That there was no ſuch Apoſtolick or Church Tradition for this *Roman* power, as our Maſters of Tradition now plead for; which all the Catholick Church muſt know. For the whole Council, with all the Churches of *Conſtantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, &c. that is, in a manner all ſave *Rome* were ignorant of that which *Zoſimus* would have had them believe, and *Bellarmine* and *H. T.* would have us to believe. 5. Note alſo how little the Church then believed the Popes infallibility. 6. Yea Note, how upon the reception of the ſeveral Copies of the Nicene Canons, they modeſtly convicted *Zoſimus* of falſhood: And how the Council reſolved againſt his uſurpation. See in the African Councils, the Epiſtle of *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, and *Atticus* of *Conſtantinople*: and the Epiſtles of the Council to *Boniface* and *Celeſtine*. In their Epiſtle to *Boniface*, before they had received their anſwers from other Churches about the

the Nicene Canons, they tell him that *they believed they should not suffer that* Arrogancy [*non sumus istum typhum passuri:*] But to *Celestine* they conclude more plainly, though modestly [*Presbyterorum quoq; & sequentium*, &c. *i. e. Let your holiness, as becometh you, repel the wicked refuges of Presbyters and the Clergy that follow them; because this is not derogate, or taken from the African Church by any Definition of the Fathers; and the Nicene Decrees most plainly committed both the inferiour Clergy, and Bishops themselves to the Metropolitans. For they did most prudently, and most justly provide, that all businesses* (N. B. all) *should be ended in the very place where they began; and the Grace of the holy Ghost will not* (or should not) *be wanting to each province: which equity should by the Priests of Christ be prudently observed, and most constantly maintained: Especially, because or is granted to every one to appeal to the Councils of their own Province, or to a Universal Council, if he be offended with the judgement of the Cognitors. Unless there should be any one that can think that our God can inspire a iustice of tryal into any one man* (N B.) *and deny it to innumerable Priests that are congregated in Council. Or how can that judgement that's past beyond sea be valid, to which the necessary persons of the witness could not be brought, either because of the infirmities of sex, or of age, many other impediments intervening. For that any* (i. e. Legates) *should be sent us from the side of your holiness, we find not constituted by any Synod of the Fathers. Because that which you sent us by our fellow Bishop* Faustinus *as done by the Nicene Council in the truer Councils, received as the Nicene,* (*sent from holy* Cyril *our fellow Bishop of the Church of* Alexandria, *and from venerable* Atticus *the Bishop of* Constantinople *out of the Authentick* (*Records,*) *which also heretofore were sent by us to* Boniface *your predecessor,*

Bishop

Bishop of venerable memory, by Innocent *a Pretbyter, and* Marcellus *Subdeacon, by whom they were from them to us directed,) in which we could find no such matter. And do not ye send your Clergy executors to potent men; do not ye yield to it; lest we seem to bring the smoaky Arrogancy of the world (or secular arrogancy) into the Church of Christ, which preferreth the light of simplicity and day of humility for them that desire to see God. For of our brother* Faustinus, *we are secure, that the safe brotherly charity in your holinesses honesty and moderation, can suffer him to stay no longer in* Africa.]

Well said *Aurelius!* Well said *Augustine!* Well said all you African Fathers! Had others stuck as close to it as you, the Papacy had been kept from the Universal Monarchy.

Note here 1. That this Council lookt no higher for the power of the Pope and other Metropolitans, than to the Council of *Nice*, and thought it a good argument, that the Pope had no such power, because no Council had so subjected the African Church: And therefore they never dreamt that Christ or the Apostles had given it him. 2. Note that they evince the Nullity of his pretended power out of the Nicene Council. 3. Note that they took him not to be above a Council, having power to dispense with its Canons. 4. Note that by the Nicene Council, not some, but all business must be ended where they begin, and this Council so interpreted them: and therefore there's no appeals to the Pope. 5. And that he that saith otherwise unjustly chargeth the Holy Ghost to be wanting to the Church. 6. That this order is to be held fast. 7. That they took it for a sufficient reason against appeals to *Rome*, because all might appeal to a provincial or general Council. 8. Note that they thought it a thing not to be imagined by a man, that God should give his Spirit to any one

man, even to the Pope, to enable him to try and judge, and deny it to a Council, General or Provincial. This ſeemed to them a thing that none ſhould imagine, ſo that they little dreamt of the Roman infallibility or power of Judging all the world. 9. Note alſo that they thought the Pope to be uncapable of this univerſal judgement, were it but by diſtance, and the natural impediments of age, ſex, and many the like, that muſt needs hinder the neceſſary witneſſes from ſuch a voyage or journey: ſo that they give an Argument from Natural neceſſity againſt the Popes pretended Soveraignty and judgement. 10. Note alſo that they plainly make ſuch judgements to be invalid for want of neceſſary witneſs and means of proſecution. 11. And whereas the Pope might object that he could prevent all this by his Legates, they flatly reject that too, and ſay they find no ſuch thing Conſtituted by any Synod: ſo that they both rejected the Popes trying and judging by Legates in other Metropolitans juriſdiction; and they took it for a ſufficient ground to do ſo, that there was no Council had ſo conſtituted; little dreaming of a Scripture conſtitution, or Apoſtolical Tradition. And if the Pope may neither judge them by himſelf nor his Legates, he may ſit ſtill. 12. Next they convince the Roman Biſhop of ſending them a falſe Canon of the Nicene Council. 13. And they ſhew us here what way the Pope then took to get and keep his Power: even by ſending to the ſecular commanders of the Provinces, (in whom they had ſpecial intereſt by their reſidence at *Rome*,) to execute their wills by force. 14. And note how the Council plainly accuſeth them for this, of introducing ſecular Arrogancy into Chriſts Church, that better loveth ſimplicity and humility and light. 15. And note how plainly they require the Biſhop of *Rome* to do ſo no more. 16. And how plainly they tell him that

Fauſtinus

Faustinus his stay any longer in *Africa* will not stand with that honesty and moderation of the Bishop of *Rome* which is necessary to the safety of brotherly charity.

I give you but the plain passages of the Council as they lye before you, and scrue no forced consequences from them. And now let *Binnius* and his brethren go make women and children believe that *it was not Appeals to* Rome, *but a troublesome manner of tryal* that the Council was against. And let *H. T.* tell men that take him for infallible, of a Nicene Canon for the Popes Supremacy and Monarchy. And let him perswade ideots and dotards that the Catholick Church in the fourth and fifth ages was for the universal Government of the Pope. And so I proceed to his next proof.

Saith H. T. [*The first* Constantinop. *Council decreed the Bishop of* Constantinople *to be chief next the Bishop of* Rome.]

Answ. 1. You see then that Primacy was but the Institution of Councils, for order sake. 2. You see then that it was grounded on a secular reason; for so saith the Canon [*because it is new Rome.*] 3. You see then that the Popes Primacy was but honorary, and gave him no universal Government: For the primacy here granted to *Constantinople*, gave them no Government over *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, &c. 4. Yea expresly the second Canon limits all Bishops without exception to their own Dioceses. And so doth the third Canon, expresly affirming, [*that according to the Nicene Council, in every Province the provincial Council ought to administer and govern all things.*] See now what a proof here is of Catholick succession of the Roman Monarchy! Nay how clearly still it is disproved to that time.

The next proof of *H. T.* is from *the third Act of the first Council of* Ephesus, [*that* Peter *yet lives and exerciſes judgement in his Succeſſors.*] *Anſw.* He turns us to look a needle in a bottle of hay. That Council is a large volume, containing ſix Tomes in *Binnius*, and not divided into Acts. But I ſuppoſe at laſt I have found the place, *Tom.* 2. *c.* 15. where the words [*that Peter was the Head of the Apoſtles*] though nothing to their purpoſe, are neither ſpoken nor approved by the Council, but only by *Philip* a Presbyter, *Celeſtine's* Legate. And the Council, though ſpecially moved by his concurrence to extol *Celeſtine* to the higheſt, yet 1. Never ſpake a word of his Governing power or Soveraignty, but only his concent: And when they mention the Roman Church, it is only their concent which they predicate. 2. And they extol *Cyril* equally with *Celeſtine* [*Novo Paulo Celeſtino,* (they forgot *Peter,*) *Novo Paulo Cyrillo:* ——— *Unus Celeſtinus, Unus Cyrillus,*] &c.

The next witneſs brought is the Council of *Chalcedon, as calling* Leo [*Univerſal Archbiſhop and Patriarch of old* Rome, *and ſentence is pronounced againſt* Dioſcorus *in the names of* Leo *and Saint* Peter.] *Anſw.* 1. This is but one of your common frauds. It was not the Council that called him univerſal Archbiſhop, but two Deacons in the ſuperſcription of their Libels, viz. *Theodorus* and *Iſchirion*. And were they the Catholick Church?

2. By [*Univerſal Archbiſhop*] it's plain that they meant no more than the *chief in dignity and order of all Archbiſhops*; and not *the Governour of all*. And that Univerſality was only in the Empire, and not over the World.

3. I have ſhewed you before that this very Council in its Canons not only gives the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* equal

equal priviledges with the Bishop of *Rome*, but expresly saith that *Rome received this primacy of order* à patribus, *from a Council, because it was* Sedes Imperii, *the seat of the Emperour.* I thought I had given you enough of this Council before. Sure I am when *Bellarmine* comes to this Canon, he hath nothing to say for his cause, but plainly to charge this famous fourth General Council with lying or falshood, and to say, that the Pope approved not this Canon. But approved or not approved, if this was the Catholick Church representative, sure I am that their testimony is valid to prove that there was then no Catholick reception of the Roman Monarchy as of God, but contrarily a meer primacy of Dignity and Honour given it newly by men.

In the sixth age he had not one Council to pretend it seems for the Roman Soveraignty; for he cites none, but about other matters (of which anon.)

In the seventh age (which he calls the sixth) though then the Soveraignty was claimed by *Boniface*, he citeth no Council for it neither.

In the eighth age (from the year seven hundred) he cites the second Council of *Nice*, as approving an Epistle of Pope *Adrian*, wherein he saith that the [*Roman Church is the Head of all Churches.*] *Answ.* 1. But whether *Adrian* himself by the Head meant the *chief in Dignity*, or the *Governour of all*, is a great doubt. But however there is no proof that he lookt further than the Empire. 2. But whatever he meant, the Synods approving his Epistle for *Images*, is no proof that they approved every word in it. 3. Yea *Tharasius* seems to imply the contrary, calling him only, *Veteris Romæ primas, & testatorum principum successor*; as if his Sea had the Priviledge only of being the Primate of *Rome*, and not the Ruler of the world. 4. But if this Council did (as it did not) openly own

the Papal Soveraignty, it had been no great honour to him: For as in their decrees for Images they contradicted two Councils at *Constantinople*; and that at *Frankford* contradicteth them; so might they as well contradict the Church in this: Even as they defined *Angels to be corporeal*, which the Council of *Lateran* afterward contradicted. But the plain truth is, it was the scope of *Adrians* Epistle as for Images, which they expressed themselves to approve. And that their Image-worship it self hath no Catholick succession, me thinks they should easily grant, considering not only, 1. That there is nothing in the first ages for them; 2. And that *Epiphanius* and many before him speak expresly against it: 3. But specially that there have been more General Councils of those ages against them than for them, and that before this of *Nice* decreed for them, the representative Catholick Church (except still the Pope be the Catholick Church) did condemn them.

I suppose by this time you will think it needless for me to follow *H. T.* any further in his Catalogue. I am content that any impartial sober person judge, whether here be a satisfactory proof of a Catholick succession of the *Papal Soveraignty*, when through so many ages, they bring not a word for any succession at all; much less that it was owned by the Catholick Church: and least of all, that all the rest of Popery was so owned.

Object. *But at least some other points of Popery are proved by* H. T. *to have such a succession.* *Answ.* Peruse his proofs and freely judge. Two of the thirty two Articles which I mentioned before he speaks to: The one is that [*Bishops, Priests and Deacons should abstain from their Wives, or be degraded.*] But 1. The Council which he cites for this, is but a Provincial

Provincial Council in *Spain* in the fifth Age: and what's this to Catholick succeſſion? 2. The Evidences for the Antiquity of Prieſts Marriages are ſo clear and numerous, that I will not thank any of them to confeſs their doctrine a Novelty. 1 *Cor.* 9. 5. *Have we not power to lead about a Siſter, a Wife, as well as other Apoſtles, and as the brethren of the Lord and* Cephas? I hope they will not deny that *Peter* had a Wife? 1 *Tim.* 3. 2, 4. *A Biſhop muſt be blameleſs, the husband of one Wife — — One that ruleth well his own houſe, having his children in ſubjection with all gravity.* Ver. 12. *Let the Deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children, and their own houſes well,* Tit. 1. 7. *If any be blameleſs, the husband of one Wife, having faithful children,* ——— The Antient Canons called the Apoſtles, ſay, Can. 6. [*Let not a Biſhop or Presbyter put away his own Wife on pretence of Religion. And if he reject her, let him be excommunicated: but if he perſevere, let him be depoſed.*] Let *Bellarmine* perſwade thoſe that will believe him, that this Canon ſpeaks but of denying them maintenance: Canons as well as Scripture are unintelligible to theſe men. The Canons at *Trull.* of the fifth and ſixth Council, do expreſly expound this Apoſtolick Canon as I do here: and they profeſs it was the Apoſtles conceſſion then to the Biſhops to marry: and they themſelves forbid any to ſeparate Prieſts from their Wives, and profeſſedly oppoſe the Roman Church in it, *Can.* 12. 13. For this *Bellarmine*, *lib.* 2. *cap.* 27. *de Pontif. Rom.* reproacheth them, and that's his anſwer. Forſooth, *the Pope approved not theſe Canons:* 1. Let *Adrians* words be read, and then judge. 2. What if he did not? Our enquiry is of Catholick Tradition

and succession, and not of the Popes opinion. But it's easie to bring much more for this.

Another point that *H. T.* proves, is, *The same Canon of Scripture which they own:* And for this he brings one Provincial Council, *Carth.* 3. as in the sixth Age. An excellent proof of Catholick succession through all Ages. But have we not better proof of the contrary? Let him that would be satisfied peruse these records and judge. *Euseb. Eccles. Hist. l.* 3. *cap.* 9. *vel.* 10. and there *Joseph. li.* 1. *cont. Apion. Constitut. Apostol.* (whosoever was the author) *lib.* 2. *cap.* 57. *Canon. Apost. ult. Dionys. Eccl. Hier. cap.* 3. *Melet. in Euseb. Eccl. Histor. lib.* 5. *cap.* 24. *Origen in Niceph. hist. Eccl. lib.* 5. *cap.* 16. *Orig. Philocal. cap.* 3. *Euseb. Hist. l.* 6. *cap.* 25. *Tertul. cont. Marcion. Carm. lib.* 4. *cap.* 7. *Athanas. Tom.* 2. *Epist.* 39. *Et in Synops. Sacr. scrip. Hilar. Pictav. Explanat. in Psalmos. Cyril.* (*vel Johan.*) *Hierosol. Catech.* 4. *Concil. Laodic. Can.* 59. *Epiphan. hæres.* 8. *&* 76. *& de Mensur. & Ponderib. Greg. Nazianz. Carmin. de veris & genuinis libris S S. Amphiloch. in Balsam. pag.* 1082. *Hieronym. in Prolog. in lib. Reg. & Prol. in lib. Solom. Et Epist. ad Latam, & passim Ruffinus in Symbolum.* But what need I cite any more, when Dr. *Cosin* hath done it in a volume purposely? where this allegation also of the third *Conc. Carthag.* is answered.

AND

AND now having ſhewed you that Papiſts cannot prove any Catholick Succeſſion, or Continuation, or Tradition of their Religion, let us conſider of their ſilly ſhift, by inſtancing in ſome by-points common to them with others. Of which I ſhall ſay the leſs becauſe I have ſpoke to it already in my *Safe Religion.*

And before I mention any particulars, remember that I have proved before that ignorance or difference about many points not eſſential to Chriſtianity, may conſiſt with our being of one Religion and Catholick Church, and therefore ſuch differences are nothing to the point of ſucceſſion of the Catholick Church or Religion. This is plain to any reaſonable man. And that the Papiſts may ſee that for their parts they have nothing to ſay againſt it, I ſhall add to what is ſaid, that they tolerate or plead for the toleration of greater differences among themſelves, which yet they affirm to conſiſt with the unity of faith. I will now give you but an inſtance or two.

The Jeſuits maintain, that if a man do but believe in their Pope and Church as infallible, he may (not only as ſome ſay, be ignorant of ſome Article of the Creed it ſelf, and yet be a true Catholick, yea and be ſaved, but alſo) believe a falſe Article as from God and the Church: The former is commonly taught not only by ſuch as *Suarez*, that ſay the Article of Chriſts Deſcent into Hell is not to all of Neceſſity to Salvation, but by many others in the Doctrine of Implicite faith. The later clauſe you may ſee among others in *Franc. Albertinus* the Jeſuite, *Corollar. pag.* 250. where his objectors put this caſe [*Suppoſe twenty Biſhops preach to a countrey-man a falſe Article, as if it were ſpoken by God and*

and the Church: that proposal of the twenty Bishops is so sufficient, that the Country-man prudently formeth an evident practical judgement, and morally certain, to believe with a speculative assent the Article proposed by the twenty Bishops, for the Authority of God as the formal reason. Three absurdities seem hence to follow. 1. That the Country-man should be obliged under mortal sin, to believe the twenty Bishops, and so the precept of faith should bind to believe a falshood. 2. The Country-man should be in Gods Grace without faith. In Grace, because he commits no mortal sin, yea he obeys the command of believing: Yet without faith, because he believes a falshood opposite to faith, and so loseth faith. 3. God should concur to deceive———. To the first Albertinus *answereth that it's no Absurdity that the command of faith do oblige to believe a falshood, it being not* per se, *but* per accidens. To the second he saith, that the *Country-man doth not lose his grace or faith; because the falshood believed is not formally opposite to the true faith (but materially)———*]Here you see that a man may hold an Article opposite to the faith materially, and yet not only be a true Christian in grace and faith, but also in so doing obey by accident the command of believing, so be it he believe in their Church. And if that be so, with what face can these men say, that our Church or Religion is new, or not the same with the Greeks, *&c.* when we have the same formal Object of faith, and differ in no Essential Material point? See here their lubricity and partiality.

One Instance more: The second Council of *Nice* that decreed for Image-Worship, doth yet expressly decree, that *Latria, Divine worship is to be given only to God: Thomas Aquinas sum. 3. q. 25. art. 3 & 4.* purposely maintaineth that *Latria, Divine Worship is to be given to the Image of Christ, and to the Cross that he dyed on;*

and

and to the ſign of that Croſs. Here is an Article of their faith expreſly contradicted: And yet *Aquinas* is a member of their Church. And if any ſay, he is no member, it's proved paſt doubt, for the Pope hath Canonized him for a Saint: So that now it is a part of their Religion to take him for a true believer: And *Albertinus* hath (as he thinks) proved, that though in many other matters of fact the Pope be fallible, yet in the Canonizing of Saints he is infallible, becauſe of ſome promiſe of Gods ſpecial aſſiſtance (if one knew where to find it.) Abundance of ſuch Inſtances might be brought that prove, that the *Papiſts own men as true believers, that deny or contradict Articles of their faith.* But what need we more, than that *France* and thouſands elſewhere are yet members of their Church, that deny the *Laterane* and *Florentine* definition for the Popes Supremacy above a General Council? and when moſt Papiſts hold that Angels are incorporeal, contrary to the definition of the ſaid ſecond Council of *Nice.* And therefore by their own law, nay much more, we may well ſay, that thoſe were of our Religion that differed from us in nothing that is indeed or in our eſteem Eſſential to the faith. Now to a few particulars.

1. The Papiſts tell us that [Fulk *confeſſeth that* Hierom, Auſtin, Ambroſe, *&c. held the invocation of Saints*] H. T. p. 49. *Anſw.* 1. If any hold that they ſhould deſire the departed Saints to pray for them, as they do the living, we have reaſon enough to take it for their errour, but it's no proof that they are not of the ſame Church and Religion with us: As long as they give no part of that adoration or honour to Saints which is proper to God the Father, Son, or Holy Ghoſt, it is not inconſiſtent with true Faith and Chriſtianity.

2. But

2. But yet we must tell you that the Primitive Church was unacquainted with the Romish prayer to Saints. Till the end of the fourth Century they are not able to prove that ever three men (if any one) were for any prayer to the Dead at all, except such a conditional speech in an Oration as *Greg. Nazianzen* hath [*If holy souls have any care or feeling of such things as these, receive this Oration*] *Orat.* 11. I intreat the Reader that needeth information of the way of Antiquity in this point, to read Bishop *Ushers* Answer to the Jesuite on this point, *page* 418, *&c.* Where he saith that [*for nine parts of the first four hundred years, he dare be bold to say that the Jesuite is not able to produce so much as one true testimony out of any Father whereby it may appear that any account at all was made of it.*] Where he citeth the full expres words of the Fathers of those first ages against praying to Saints, as *Origen in Jos. Hom.* 16. And in *Rom. lib.* 2. *cap.* 2. And *Contr. Celsum. lib.* 8. *pag.* 432, 433, 406, 411, 412. *& lib.* 5. *pag.* 239. *Tertullian Apol. cap.* 30. *Tertullian* and *Cyprian* of Prayer: *Athanasius Orat.* 4. *Cont. Arium pag.* 259, 260. *Eccles. Smyrn. apud Euseb. Hist. lib.* 4. *&c.* I am loth to recite what is there already given you.

3. And when Prayer to the dead did come in, how exceedingly it differed from the Romish Prayers to the dead, I pray you read there in the same Author.

4. And also of those Adorations and Devotions offered by the Papists to the Virgin *Mary*, I desire you to read in the same Author and Place; enough to make a Christian tremble, and which for my part I am not able to excuse from horrid Blasphemy or Idolatry, though I am willing to put the best interpretation on their words that reason will allow.

5. The Reason why in the old Testament men were not wont to pray to Saints, *Bellarmine* saith was *because*

becauſe then they did not enter into Heaven nor ſee God. Bellar. de ſanct. Beat. li. 2. cap. 19. So *Suarez* in the third part, *Tom. 2. diſp. 42. Sect. 1.* But abundance of the chief Doctors of the Church for divers Ages were of opinion that the Saints are not admitted into Heaven to the clear ſight of God before the day of Judgement (as moſt of the Eaſtern Churches do to this day) therefore they could not be for the Popiſh Prayer to Saints.

And here again obſerve, that men may be of the ſame faith and Church with us, that differ and err in as great a matter as this. The Council of *Florence* hath now defined it, that *departed ſouls are admitted into Heaven to the clear ſight of God:* And yet *Stapleton* and *Franciſ. Pegna. à Caſtro, Medina, Sotus,* affirm that *Irenæus, Juſtin Martyr, Tertullian, Clemens Romanus, Origen, Ambroſe, Chryſoſtome, Auſtin, Lactantius, Victorinus, Prudentius, Theodoret, Aretas, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Euthymius,* yea and *Bernard,* have delivered the contrary ſentence. See *Staplet. Defenſ. Eccleſ. author. cont. Whitak. lib. 1. cap. 2.* with *Fran. Pegna in part. 2. Director. Inquiſitor. com. 21.*

Now as all theſe muſt needs be againſt the Popiſh Invocation of Saints, ſo they were againſt that which is now determined to be *de fide*; Whence I gather (on the by) 1. That the Romiſh faith increaſeth, and is not the ſame as heretofore. 2. That they had not this Article by Tradition from any of theſe Fathers, or from the Apoſtles by them (unleſs from the Scriptures.) 3. That men that err in ſuch points as are now defined by Councils to be *de fide,* are yet accounted by Papiſts to be of their Church and faith: And therefore they may be of ours, notwithſtanding ſuch errours as this in hand. 4. And note alſo by this taſte, whether the Papiſts be not a perjured generation, that ſwear

not

not to expound Scripture but according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

6. The Council of *Laodicea* condemned them as Idolaters that prayed to Angels, *Can.* 35. (which *Caranza*, *Crab*, and other Papists have turned into *Angulos*; whose falsification you may see fully detected by the said Bishop *Usher*, *ibid. pag.* 470, 471, 472. Read there also the full Testimonies of *Greg. Nyssen*, *Athanasius*, *Epiphanius*, *&c.* against praying to Saints and Angels, and the detection of *Bellarmines* fraud, that pretendeth the Fathers to speak of the Gentiles Idolatry; when they mention the Virgin *Mary* and the Saints, and say expresly they were not to be adored.)

But for all this, *H. T. Manual. page* 291, *&c.* hath Fathers for this Adoration of Angels and Saints. And who are they? The first is *Dionysius*: to which I answer, 1. There is never a such a word in the place cited in *Dionysius*, in the Book that I have at hand, Printed *Lugdun.* 1572. 2. We are for praying the Saints to pray for us too, that is, those on earth: And the words cited by him, mention not the Saints in Heaven. 3. That *Dionysius* is not *Dionysius* but a spurious Apocryphal Book: Not once known and mentioned in the world till *Greg.* the great's dayes, (six hundred years after Christ) as *Bellarmine* himself saith *Lib. de Scriptor. Eccles. de Dionys.* and *lib.* 2. *de Monach. cap.* 5.

The second is *Clem. Apostol. Constit.* 5. *Answ.* 1. The words speak only of honouring the Martyrs, which is our unquestioned duty; but not of Praying to them. 2. It's an Apocryphal forgery, and neither the Apostles nor *Clements* Work which he citeth (but any thing will serve these men): Let him believe *Bellarmine de Scriptor. Eccles. pag.* 38, 39. where he proveth it, and saith that [*in the Latine Church*,

Church, these Constitutions are of almost no account, and the Greeks themselves Canon. 2. Trul. *reject them as depraved by Hereticks, and that the receiving of them is it that misleadeth the Æthiopians.*] See more against them in *Cooks Censurâ, pag.* 17, 18, 19. and *Rivets Crit. Sac. & Dalæus in Pseudepigrap.*

The third Testimony of *H. T.* is from *Justins* second *Apol. Answ.* It is not Praying to Angels that *Justin* seemeth to intend, but giving them due honour, which we allow of. His intent is to stop the mouths of Heathens that called the Christians impious for renouncing their Gods: To whom he replyeth, that we *yet honour the true God, and his Angels,* &c.——

His Testimony for the third age is only *Origen* (and yet none of *Origen:*) First in his *Lament. Answ.* 1. *Origen* there mentioneth the Saints, but not the dead Saints. It may be all the Saints in the Church on earth whose prayers he desireth. 2. If this satisfie you not, at least be satisfied with this, that you cite a forgery that is none of *Origens* works. Not only *Erasmus* saith that [*This Lamentation was neither written by* Origen, *nor translated by* Hierom, *but is the fiction of some unlearned man, that by this trick devised to defame* Origen:] but *Baronius Annal. Tit.* 2. *ad an.* 253. *p.* 477. witnesseth that Pope *Gelasius* numbers it with the Apocryphals.

But *H. T.* hath a second testimony from *Origen. in Cantic. Hom.* 3. *Answ.* 1. That speaks of the Saints prayer for us, but not of our prayers to them one word, which is the thing in question. 2. But *Erasmus* and others have shewed that neither is this any of *Origens* works. *Sixtus Senensis* saith, that some old Books put *Hieroms* name to it: And *Lombard* and *Aquinas* cite passages out of it as *Ambrose's.*

You

You see now what Testimonies *H. T.* hath produced for the first three Ages, even till above four hundred years after Christ. And yet no doubt but this is currant proof with the poor deluded Papists that read his Book.

2. The next exception to be considered is, *Praying for the Dead:* which they say *the ancient Church was for.*

Answ. 1. We are for the Commemoration of the holy lives and sufferings of the Saints. And the first sort of the ancients prayers for them began here, as the occasion. 2. We are for thankful acknowledgement of Gods Mercies to the departed Saints, and to the Church by them. And the first prayers for them were such as these. 3. Bishop *Usher* hath copiously proved that they were Saints, supposed to be in Heaven or Paradise, and not in Purgatory, that were then prayed for: and therefore that it was not the Popish praying for tormented souls that was then practised: And therefore their prayers then were besides Commemorations and Thanksgivings, the petitioning of all those following Mercies for them which are not to be received till the resurrection: *Bellarmine* himself proving that *though we were certain that the blessed souls shall have a raised glorified body, and be justified in the last Judgement, yet may it be prayed for, because it is yet future.* Now we are far from being of another Church or Religion than those that hold such an opinion as this. Saith *Usher pag.* 224. when he had cited many testimonies [*In these and other prayers of the like kind, we may descry evident footsteps of the primary intention of the Church in her supplications for the dead: which was that the whole man (not the soul separated only) might receive publick remission of sins, and a solemn acquittal in the judgement of that great day; and so obtain both a full escape from all the*

Con-

Consequences of sin (the last enemy being now destroyed, and death swallowed up in victory,) and a perfect consummation of bliss and happiness: all which are comprized in that short prayer of St. Paul *for* Onesiphorus *(though made for him while he was alive,)* [*The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day*]. *Yea, divers prayers for the dead of that kind are still retained in the* Roman *Offices; of which the great Spanish Doctor* John Medina *thus writeth;* [*Although I have read many prayers for the faithful deceased, which are contained in the* Roman *Missal, yet have I read in none of them that the Church doth petition, that they may more quickly be freed from pains: but I have read that in some of them petition is made, that they may be freed from everlasting pains.*] *Again there be other prayers (*saith Medina*) wherein petition is made, that God would raise the souls of the dead in their bodies unto bliss at the day of judgement.*]

You see then, that our Question is not whether the dead may be prayed for: but what prayers may be made for them? And therefore to find that about three hundred years after Christ (more or less) men begun to pray for the dead, is no proof that they were not of our Church or Religion; or that therefore we want succession. It was not a praying to be sooner out of Purgatory that then was used, as Papists do, but a Praying for the mercies promised at the Resurrection: And thus we think it lawful to pray for the dead; were it not for the accidental evil that might follow with them that will misunderstand and abuse it.

And it's further to be noted, that as *Pegna*, *Stapleton* and others confess, the Fathers, Greek and Latine, before mentioned, did believe that men had not their perfect Joyes till the Resurrection; and therefore they had the far stronger motive to pray for the dead.

And if Protestants had not been partly of this mind (save only that we put not the soul into hidden receptacles, nor any where but with Christ,) *Bellarmine* had not found so much occasion of that unworthy calumny against *Calvin* for the words cited by him in his *Instit.* as if he denyed the beatifical vision, if not the immortality of the soul: Even because he took not *our bliss to be perfect till the Resurrection, but somewhat short of what we shall then be.* Now seeing the Fathers were so commonly of that mind, and the *Greeks* and *Æthiopians* are still of that mind and *Bellarmine* saith *Luther* and *Calvin* are of that mind you may see that neither in that nor the point of praying for the dead as used by the antients, is our distance so great as to weaken the proof of our succession, or make us to be of two Churches or Religions.

And here you may see the differences between the Prayers for the dead which are used by the Papists, and by the Eastern Churches to this day. And yet if upon private unsound opinions any should go somewhat further in this point, it followeth not that such error changeth the faith. I desire the Reader that would have a fuller sight of the face of Antiquity in this point, to read Bishop *Usher* of it in the forementioned Answer to the Jesuite.

3. Another point that they much challenge us about, is, *The Veneration or Adoration of Images, Reliques, and the Cross*, to which I may join *Peregrinations to places esteemed by them to be of eminent holiness.* Concerning *Peregrinations*, you may see by a plain Epistle of *Gregory Nyssen* (in the end of his printed works, but in the midst of a *M. S.* in *Paris* Library) written purposely against going on Pilgrimage to *Jerusalem*, what is to be thought of this. He adviseth even the retired Monasticks, even in those Countreyes that were

near

near *Judæa*, to forbear such Pilgrimages as dangerous and unnecessary, and not at all commanded in the Scripture. The Papists did as long as they could perswade the world that this Epistle was none of *Gregories*, and when they were made ashamed of that, they would expound it as prohibiting Pilgrimages to none but the Monasticks: And sure if it should be forbidden them, then much more should others be forbidden, that have not the leasure, and pretend not to the devotions which these pretend to. Read but the Epistle it self without either *Molinæus* his notes on our side, or *Gretsers* frivolous answers, and judge as thou seest cause.

As for *Images*, we allow the Historical use of them, and the setting them up in Churches the *Lutherans* allow, and we dislike it only as dangerous and a needless snare, but take not our selves to be of another Church or Religion from those that are otherwise minded: No nor from those that Reverence them as they respect the persons whom they signifie. But it's one thing to *use Images*, and another thing to *use them Popishly*, which is to make them *mediate objects of Divine worship*, yea to worship the very *Image it self, and the Cross and the sign of the Cross, with the same worship as we do him that is signified by them:* So that we confidently affirm, 1. That the Primitive Church did make no use of Images at all in the worship of God, no nor endure them in the place of Worship. 2. That when they were first brought in, the Popish use of them was still renounced and detested. *Clemens Alexandrinus Protrept. ad Gent.* saith that [*We are plainly forbidden to use that deceitful Art*] (of painting or image-making:), —— And [*We have no sensible Image made of any sensible matter, but such an Image as is to be conceived with the understanding.*]

Origen against *Celsus lib. 7. page* 373, 384, 386, 387. is large and plain against this use of Images, as the Protestants are. And the *Eliber. Concil. C.* 36. saith [*Placuit picturas in Ecclesia esse non debere, ne quod colitur, aut adoratur in parietibus depingatur. It seemeth good to us, that Pictures ought not to be in the Church, lest that which is worshipped or adored should be painted on Walls.*] Some Papists would fain find a sense for this Canon contrary to the words: But *Melch. Canus* plainly saith, that the *Council did not only imprudently but impiously make this law to take away Images, Loc. Theol. lib.* 5. *cap.* 4. *conc.* 4. I shall cite no more, but intreat the Reader that is willing to be informed how much Antiquity was against the Papists in the points of Images, to peruse only *Dallæus de Imaginibus, and* Usher *in his Answer to the Jesuite, and Sermon to the Parliament*: And I provoke the Papists to confute what is in them alledged if they can.

H. T. hath no better shift to salve their credit (*Manual page* 319, 320.) than to set their own Schoolmen and General Council together by the ears. The second Council of *Nice* (that did most for Images) did openly renounce the adoring them with Divine honour, and *Tharasius* solemnly professed, [*Duntaxat in unum verum Deum latriam & fidem se referre & reponere They did refer and repose faith and Divine Worship in the true God alone*]: But *Aquinas sum.* 3. *q.* 25. *a.* 3, & 4. maintaineth (as I before observed) that *the Images of Christ, and the Cross* [*and the sign of the Cross, are to be worshipped with Divine worship.*] And what saith *H. Turbervile* to this? Why [*This is a meer school opinion and not of faith with us: Urge not therefore what some particular Divines say; but hearken to the Doctrine of Gods Church.* ——] Very good!

Is

Is not this ſo groſs a kind of jugling, that would never down if devout ignorance and implicite faith had not prepared the ſtomachs of the people? 1. You ſee here that to *contradict the Determination of a General Council*, is not *of faith* with them. But is it not *againſt your faith?* Do you give leave to meer ſchool opinions to contradict General Councils? See here what's become of the Popiſh faith? If the Determinations of Councils be not Articles of faith with you, then you have no faith, but give up your cauſe: And if they be, then *Aquinas* and his followers are Hereticks. 2. And then ſee what's become of the Popes Infallibility in Canonizing Saints, that have Sainted *Thomas Aquinas*, that proves a Heretick by your Law: ſo that your cauſe is gone which way ever you turn you. 3. And then ſee what it is to *pray to Saints*, when ſome of them are *made Hereticks by your own Laws.* 4. And then alſo ſee, at what Unity the Church of *Rome* is among themſelves, when it is the very common Doctrine of their learned Schoolmen, which contradicteth a General Council: Are you not well agreed that while? 5. And laſtly note what a *Holy* Church you have, when the common ſort of your moſt learned Divines are thus made Hereticks: See Biſhop *Uſhers* allegations of *Thomas Arundels* Provincial Council at *Oxford*, 1408. *ex Guil. Linewood lib.* 5. And *Jac. Naclantus in Rom. cap.* 1. *fol.* 42, ſaith [*We muſt not only confeſs, that the faithful in the Church do worſhip before the Image, as ſome cautelouſly ſpeak, but that they adore the Image, without any ſcruple: yea and that they worſhip it with the ſame worſhip as the Prototype: ſo that if it be worſhipt with Divine worſhip, the Image muſt have Divine worſhip*———]. And *Cabrera in* 3. *part. Thom. qu.* 25. *art.* 3. *diſp.* 2. *num.* 15. there cited by *Uſher*, ſaith [*that it is of faith*

hat Images are to be worſhipped, in Churches and without: and we muſt give them ſigns of ſervitude and ſubmiſſion, by embracing, lights, offering incenſe, uncovering the head, &c. 2. *That Images are truly and properly to be adored, with an intention to adore themſelves, and not only the ſamplars repreſented in them. This Concluſion is againſt* Durandus *and his followers, whoſe opinion by the Moderns is judged dangerous, raſh, and ſavouring of Hereſie: and* M. Medina *reporteth that* M. Victoria *reputed it heretical: but our concluſion is the common one of Divines. If Images be improperly only adored, then they are not to be adored ſimply and abſolutely; which is manifeſt Hereſie. And if Images were to be worſhipped only by way of Remembrance, becauſe they make us remember the ſamplars, which we thus adore as if they were preſent, it would follow that all creatures are to be adored with the ſame adoration as God* —— *which is abſurd.* 3. *The Opinion of* Saint Thomas, *that the Image muſt be worſhipped with the ſame act of adoration, as the ſamplar which it repreſenteth, is moſt true, moſt pious, and very conſonant to the decrees of faith.*] Thus *Cabrera*, who adds, that this is the doctrine of *Thomas* and all his Diſciples, and almoſt all the old Schoolmen, and particularly of *Cajetan*, *Capreolus*, *Paludanus*, *Ferrarienſis*, *Antoninus*, *Soto*, *Alexand. Aleſ. Albertus Magnus*, *Bonaventura*, *Richardus de media villa*, *Dionyſius Carthuſianus*, *Major*, *Marſilius*, *Thom. Waldenſis*, *Turrecremata*, *Clichtovæus*, *Turrian*, *Vaſquez*, &c. And *Azorius* ſaith [*It is the conſtant opinion of Divines,*] *Inſtitut. Moral. tom.* 1. *lib.* 9. *cap.* 6. Yea in the *Roman* Pontifical publiſhed by the Authority of *Clement* the eighth, it is expreſſed, that [*The Legates Croſs ſhall have the right hand, becauſe Divine worſhip is due to it.*] See here whether the Pope

Pope himſelf be not an Heretick, and the Pontifical contain not hereſie, and the whole rabble of the Schoolmen Hereticks, by contradicting the determination of the General Council at *Nice* 2, which *H. T.* citeth, and the Doctrine which he ſaith, is the Doctrine of Gods Church. Such is the faith and unity of the Papiſts.

But they will ſay ſtill *that though all theſe worſhip the very Croſs and Images themſelves, and that with Divine worſhip, yet there be ſome of a better mind, that do but worſhip God by the Image, ſuch as* H. T. *&c. Anſw.* And do you think that rational Pagans did not know as well as you that their Images were not Gods themſelves, and ſo worſhipped them not as Gods, but as the repreſenters and inſtruments of ſome Diety? *Lactantius Inſtit. lib. 2. cap. 2.* brings them in ſaying thus [*Non ipſa*, &c. *We fear not them, but thoſe whom they repreſent, and to whoſe names they are conſecrated.*] And *Arnobius* thus [*Deos per ſimulachra veneramur: It is the Gods that we worſhip by Images.*] And *Auguſtine* thus reporteth the Pagans ſaying in *Pſal. 96.* [*Non ego lapidem*, &c. *I do not worſhip that ſtone, nor that Image, which is without ſenſe.*] And in *Pſal. 113. conc. 2.* [*Nec ſimulachrum, nec dæmonium colo*, &c. *I worſhip neither the Image, nor a Spirit in it; but by the bodily likeneſs I behold the ſign of that which I ought to worſhip.*] Yea that many of them renounced the worſhipping of Devils, appeareth by *Auguſtines* report of their words, in *Pſal. 96.* [*Non colimus mala dæmonia*, &c. *We worſhip not evil ſpirits: It is thoſe that you call Angels, that we worſhip, who are the powers of the great God, and the Miniſters of the great God.*] To whom *Auſtine* anſwers [*Would you would worſhip them* (that is, honour them *aright*,) *then you would eaſily learn of them*

not to worſhip them.] And doubtleſs few could be ſo ſilly as to think there were as many *Jupiters* or *Apollos* as there were Images of them in the world. So that you ſee here that ſome of the Pagans as to Image-worſhip diſclaimed that which the Papiſts aſcribe to them, *viz. Divine worſhip.*

Oh but ſaith *H. T. tell us not of particular Doctors, but of the Doctrine of Gods Church. Anſw.* What! not of Saint *Thomas?* What! not of the Army of School Divines before mentioned? What! not of the [*Communis ſententia Theologorum,*] the common judgement of Divines? for ſo they call it; What? not of that which is *de fide, or conſonant to it, and whoſe contrary is Hereſie*, or *ſavours of Hereſie?* (as they ſay of *Durandus* opinion.) What! not of Pope *Clement* the eighth and the Roman Pontifical? (*page* 672.) Wonderful! are all theſe *no body* in your Church? O admirable harmony that is in your united Church!

But you can agree to leave out the ſecond commandment leſt the very words ſhould deter the people from Image worſhip; and to make an irrational diviſion of the tenth to blind their eyes. And yet you cry up the Teſtimony of the Fathers, when you are fain to hide one of the ten commandments, ſo that thouſands of your poor ſeduced followers, know not that there is ſuch a thing. No wonder if you caſt away *Gregory Nyſſen's* Epiſtle againſt *Pilgrimages*; and *Epiphanius* his words (in the end of his Epiſtle to *Johan. Hieroſol.*) againſt Images; and if *Vaſquez* (in 3 *Thom. diſp.* 105. *c.* 3.) contrary to the plain words do faign that it *was the Image of a prophane or common man that* Epiphanius *pull'd down*; and Al. Cope (Dial. 5. c. 21.) ſay, *that the Epiſtle is counterfeit and not Epiphanius's*; and if *Bellarmine* (*de Imag. c.* 9) and

Baronius

Baronius (ad an. 392) say *that this part of the Epistle is forged:* and if Alphons. à Castro. (cont. Hæres. de Imag.) *reproach* Epiphanius *for it as an Iconoclast.* So well are you agreed also in the confutation of the Fathers Testimonies, that any way will serve your turn, though each man have his several way. Fair fall *Vasquez* that plainly confesseth, that *indeed the Scripture doth forbid not only the worship of an Image for God, but also the worshipping of the true God in an Image: but* saith, *that this commandment is now repealed, and therefore under the Gospel we may do otherwise.* (*Vasq. li.* 2. *de Adorat. Disp.* 4. *c.* 3. *Sect.* 74. 75. *& c.* 4. *Sect.* 84.)

But of this point I shall say no more now but this. 1. Many Christian Churches do reject Images from their Churches and worship as well as Protestants. 2. More reject statues that reject not pictures. 3. Many that keep them, worship not them, nor God in them, or by them, as by a mediate object. 4. General Councils have been against Images, that want nothing but the pleasure of the Pope, to make them of as good authority as the Council that was for them. 5. That Council that was for them (*Nice* 2.) condemneth the Schoolmen and Pope *Clement* himself as Hereticks, for worshiping them, or the Cross with Divine worship. 6. I again urge any Papist *to answer Dallæus* book rationally that can. 7. To spare me the labour of saying more of the judgement of the ancient Catholick Church against the Popish use of Images, I desire the Reader to peruse what *Cassander* an honest Papist hath written to that end, *Consultat. de Imag. & simulac.* who begins thus [*Ad Imagines vero sanctorum quod attinet, certum est, initio prædicati Evangelii aliquanto tempore inter Christianos, præsertim in Ecclesiis, imaginum usum non fuisse, ut ex Clemente & Arnobio patet: Tandem picturas in Ecclesiam*

ſiam admiſſas ut rerum geſtarum hiſtoriam exprimentes &c. ——] And he produceth abundance from antiquity againſt the preſent Popiſh uſe of them.

4. Another points in which the Papiſts pretend to better Countenance from Antiquity than we, is the point of *the Corporal preſence with Tranſubſtantiation:* But of this there is ſo much ſaid by multitudes of our Divines, that I ſhall now ſay no more, but deſire the ſtudious to Read at leaſt Biſhop *Ushers Anſw. to the Jeſuite* of it, and *Edmundus Abertinus de Euchariſtia:* a Treatiſe ſo full of evidence from Scripture, Reaſon, and the judgement of the Fathers, that I boldly challenge all the Papiſts in the world to give a tolerable anſwer to it, that is, a better than that is given, and which *Clodius* hath conſuted.

When we have thus ſhewed them the ſtream of Antiquity to have been againſt them, they paſs us by, and thruſt into the ignorant peoples hands, a few muſty ſcraps of abuſed words, which are anſwered and cleared over and over: Thus do *H. T. D. Baily*, and others.

5. In the point of Satisfaction and Purgatory, beſides what *Sadeel*, *Chamier* and others have ſaid, *Uſher* and the foreſaid *Dallæus* in a full Treatiſe have ſhewed the Papiſts nakedneſs from Antiquity, ſo that modeſty ſhould forbid them to pretend the Fathers for them any more, if any modeſty be left.

6. About their Faſts (though that be no eſſential of Religion) both the time, manner, *&c.* is ſo fully ſpoke to by the ſaid *Dallæus* in another juſt volume *de Jejuniis*, that Popery in this alſo is openly condemned by the Fathers in the view of the impartial conſiderate world.

The point of Free will, and moſt of the reſt in which they imagine that we diſſent from Antiquity or the Eaſtern

Eaſtern Churches, I have ſpoke to already in my firſt Book againſt Popery. I had thought to have gone through the reſt particularly, at leaſt the reſt mentioned by *H. T.* and *D. Baily*; but finding them ſo frequently and fully handled already, I will forbear ſuch labour in vain. See alſo *Dallæus de cultu Latinorum*, proving that for the three firſt centuries, their corruptions in worſhip were not uſed.

CHAP. XXVI.

Detect. 17. ANother of the Papiſts Deceits, and one of the Principal that they ſupport their cauſe with, is, *A falſe interpretation and application of all the ſayings of the Fathers, which they can but force to a ſhew of countenancing their ſupremacy.* That you may find out their jugling in this, I ſhall ſhew you ſome of their Footſtepts more particularly.

1. *Any claim that their own ambitious Biſhops have made to a further power than was to due to them, they uſe as an Argument for their univerſal ſoveraignty:* When as we deny not but that there was too much pride and Ambition in their Prelates (which is all that this will prove;) even in ſome that otherwiſe might be good men. We deny not but that *Zoſimus* would fain have extorted a confeſſion of his uſurped power, and a ſubmiſſion to it from *Aurelius*, *Auguſtine*, and the reſt of the *African* Council: But yet he could not do it. We confeſs that *Leo* the firſt, and *Gregory* the firſt, and others, were very buſie for the extending of their power: And that the *Roman* Biſhops were long endeavouring to have put the halter on the *Africans* heads, yea and long about the *French* before they got them under.

And

And shall these particular ambitious men be the witnesses? And because they would have had more power, doth it follow that it was their due?

2. Again, *if they find that any distressed Churches or Bishops have but sent to* Rome *for help, they presently gather thence that they took the Pope to be Christs Vicar General.* As when *Chrysostome* sent to *Innocent*, and *Basil* and the rest in the East did send so oft for help into the West: When as the reasons were but such as these; 1. Because *Rome* during the Emperors residence there, was the place where life or death was last pronounced on every mans cause by the secular power: and therefore the Bishop of *Rome* had the greater opportunity to befriend other Churches. 2. And afterwards *Rome* had a great secular influence on the Empire. 3. And because in the divisions of the East about Arianisme, they thought the countenance of the Orthodox in the West might have done somewhat to turn the scales. 4. Because the Bishop of *Rome* being taken for the Patriarch of the first place, his voice might do much against an adversary.

I will delay you now with no more instances, than those of *Basils* time from the East. *Eusebius*, *Meletius*, *Basil*, and the rest of the Orthodox, being both pestered with the *Arians*, and all to pieces also among themselves, do send for help to the West, (*Basil. Ep.* 69.) But to whom? and for what? Not to the Bishop of *Rome* only, nor by name, but equally to the Bishops of *Italy* and *France*, without any mention of the *Roman* power. And it was not that the Pope might decide all by his Soveraign power, which certainly was so near a way to their relief, that no wise man can Imagine them so mad as to forget it, if it had been a thing then known and approved of: But only they desire that some may be sent to help them to be the stronger party

in

in a Synod, or at leaſt ſome one to comfort them, and put ſome countenance on their cauſe. And *Epiſt.* 70, *Baſil* writeth himſelf (in the name of the reſt:) But to whom? [*To the Biſhops of* France *and* Italy,] and *France* before *Italy*; without taking notice of an *univerſal Head* of the Church at *Rome*. And what doth he ſo importune them for? Not that the Pope would decide the controverſie: but that they would acquaint the Emperour with their ſtate (becauſe the Weſt had an Orthodox Emperour, and the Eaſt an *Arian*,) or ſend ſome to them to ſee how it ſtood with them: So that it was but either help from the Emperour, or countenance from the number of Biſhops (becauſe they were over-voted quite at home) that they deſired. So *Epiſt.* 74 *Baſil* again writes [*to the Biſhops of the Weſt*,] (and ſo no more to the *Roman* Biſhop than the reſt;) and he giveth theſe as his Reaſons [*For*, (ſaith he) *what we here ſpeak is ſuſpected, as if we ſpoke through private contention.* — *But for you, the further you are remote from them by habitation, ſo much credit you have with the people, whereto is added that the grace of God helpeth you to relieve the oppreſſed: And if* Many *of you unanimouſly decree the ſame things, it is manifeſt that the multitude, will produce a certain reception of your opinion.*] Wonderful! if there were then a Vicar General of Chriſt at *Rome*, that it never came into their mind to crave his deciſion or help, as ſuch?

O but ſay the Papiſts, that was becauſe they had to do only with the *Arians*, that cared for no authority that was againſt them. *Anſw.* 1. But would theſe *Arians* have ſo much regarded the votes of the *French* and *Italian* Biſhops, yea or a few men ſent from them, and yet not regard the Head of the Church? The *Arians* ſure had heard of this Headſhip, if any had. And would not the Orthodox deſire ſo much as a word

word from *Rome* for this advantage? 2. But it is falſe that they were only the *Arians* that they called for help againſt. They expreſly ſay, that it was *alſo becauſe they were divided among themſelves*, (by perſonal quarrels.) How importunately doth *Gregory Nyſſen* afterward call for help from others, and telleth *Flavianus*, in his *Epiſt.* to him, of their miſery as if all were loſt? And the only ſad inſtance was, that *Helladius* (counted a good Biſhop) had proudly neglected him, and made him ſtand at his door (when he went to viſit him) a great while before he was let in; and then did not bid him ſit down; and then did not ſpeak to him firſt but two or three ſtrange angry words. This was the great buſineſs. But to proceed with *Baſil. Epiſt.* 77. he falls to chiding the Weſtern Biſhops, for not ſending to them, nor regarding them and their communion: and to touch their pride, he addeth, [*We have one Lord, one faith, one hope. Whether you think your ſelves the Head of the univerſal Church, the head cannot ſay to the feet, I have no need of you, or if you place your ſelves in the order of other Church-members, you cannot ſay to us, we need you not.*] And would you here believe that the Papiſts have the faces to cite this paſſage of *Baſil*, for their Headſhip, becauſe here is the word *Head!* When as it's plain, 1. That *Baſil* by the *Head* means but the *chiefeſt part*, and not the *Soveraign power.* 2. That he ſpeaks to *all the Biſhops of the Weſt*, and not only to the *Roman Biſhop.* 3. That he doth it as a ſmart reproof of their arrogancy, and not in any approbation at all. But any thing will ſerve them. More from *Baſil* I ſhall have occaſion to mention anon.

3. Note alſo, that when *the Papiſts find but any Hereſie condemned by the Biſhop of* Rome, *they cite this as a Teſtimony of their Soveraignty*: As if other Patriarchs

archs and Bishops condemned them not as well as they; Or as if we knew not that the Church desired the most general vote against Hereticks, and therefore would be loth to leave so great a Bishop out.

4. *And when they find the Pope excommunicating forreign Bishops, they cry up this as a Testimony of his Headship:* As if we did not know, 1. That to refuse Communion with another Church or Bishop is no act of Jurisdiction over them. 2. That other Bishops have made bold also to excommunicate the Pope: I'le now but recite those words of *Nicephorus lib. 17. cap. 26.* which you use to glory in (as many do in their own shame,) [Vigilius (saith he) *proceeded to that insolency, that he excommunicated* Mennas *for four moneths. And* Mennas *did the same by him: But* Justinian *being moved to anger with such things, sent some to lay hold on him. But* Vigilius *being afraid of himself, fled to the Altar of* Sergius *the Martyr, and laid hold on the sacred Pipes, and would not be drawn away till he had put them down* ——]. But by the Mediation of the Empress *Theodora*, the Pope was pardoned, and *Menna* and he absolved one another. A fair proof of the Vicarship! 3. And so it was, that Pope *Honorius* was condemned for an Heretick by two or three General Councils.

5. Also *when they meet with any big words of their own Popes (as, I command this or that) they take it for a proof of the Vicarship:* As if big words did prove Authority. Or as if we knew not how lowlily and poorly they spoke to those that were above them. As *Gregory* the first for instance, was high enough towards those that he thought he could master: but what low submissive language doth he use to secular Governors that were capable of overtopping him? And what flattering language did his successors use

uſe to the moſt baſe murderers and uſurpers of the Empire?

6. Another *Roman* deceit is this; *when they find any mention of the exerciſe of the (now thriving)* Roman *Power, over their own Dioceſs or Patriarchal circuit, they would hence prove his univerſal Power over all.* And by that Rule the Patriarch of *Alexandria* or *Conſtantinople* may prove as much.

7. Alſo *when they meet with the paſſages that ſpeak of the elevation of their Pope to be the firſt Patriarch, in the* Roman *Empire, or any Power that by the Emperours was given him, they cunningly confound the Empire with the world, and ſpecally if they find it called by the name of the world; and they would perſwade you that all other Chriſtians and Churches on earth, did aſcribe as much to the Biſhop of* Rome, *as the* Roman *Empire did.* It's true that he was in the *Empire* acknowledged to be firſt in order of dignity, becauſe of *Rome* the ſeat of his *Epiſcopacy*; eſpecially when General Councils began to trouble themſelves and the world about ſuch matters of precedency. And it's well known from the language of their writers, as well as from the words of *Luke* 2. 1. that they uſually called *the Empire, all the world:* And from ſuch paſſages would the Papiſts prove the Primacy at leaſt of the Pope over all the world. But put theſe Juglers to it, to prove if they can, that beyond the Rivers *Meroes and Euphrates*, and beyond the bounds of the *Roman* Empire, the Pope did either exerciſe Dominion, or was once ſo much as regarded by them, any more than any other Biſhop, except there were any adjacent Iſland or Countrey that had their dependence upon the Empire. I hope they will not deny that the Church extended much beyond the Empire: (Though our Hiſtory of that part of it be much defective.) And let them prove

prove if they can, that ever any of those Churches had any regard to the Roman Bishop, any more than to another man. Let them tell you where either the Empire of the Abassines or any other out of the line of the Imperial power, was any whit like-subject to the Pope.

8. But their chief fraud is about *names* and *words. When they meet with any high complemental title given to the Bishop of* Rome, *they presently conclude that it signifieth his Soveraignty.* Let us instance in some particulars, and shew the vanity of their conclusions from them.

1. Sometimes the Roman Bishops are called [*Summi Pontifices,*] the *chief Popes:* and hence some gather their Supremacy. But I suppose you will believe *Baronius* (their chief flatterer) in such a case as this. And he tells you in *Martyrolog. Roman. April.* 9. that [*Fuit olim vetus ille usus in Ecclesia, ut Episcopi omnes, non tantum Pontifices, sed & Summi Pontifices dicerentur* ——— i. e. *It was the ancient custom of the Church to call all Bishops not only* Pontifices *Popes, but chief Popes.*] And then citing such a passage of *Hierom Epist.* 99. he addeth [*Those that understand not this ancient custom of speech, refer these words to the Popedom of the Church of* Rome.]

2. As for the names *Papa*, Pope, *Dominus*, *Pater sanctissimus*, *beatissimus*, *dei amantissimus*, &c. it's needless to tell you that these were commonly given to other Bishops.

3. And what if they could find that *Rome* were called *the mother of all Churches?* I have formerly shewed you, where *Basil* saith of the Church of *Cæsarea*, that it is *as the mother of all Churches in a manner.* And *Hierusalem* hath oft that Title.

4. Sometime they find where *Rome* is called *Caput Eccleſiarum*, and then they think they have won the cauſe. When if you will conſult the words, you ſhall find that it is no more than that *Priority of Dignity* which (not Chriſt, but) the Emperours and Councils gave them, that is intended in the word. It's called the *Head*, that is, the *chief Seat in Dignity*, without any meaning that the Pope is the univerſal Monarch of the world.

5. But what if they find the Pope called *the Archbiſhop of the Catholick Church, or the Univerſal Biſhop?* then they think they have the day. I anſwer, Indeed three flattering Monks at the Council of *Chalcedon*, do ſo ſuperſcribe their libells; but they plainly mean no more than *the Biſhop that in order of dignity is above the reſt*; And many particular Churches are oft called *Catholick Churches*. There's difference between [*A Catholick Church*] and [*The Catholick Church.*] And the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* had that Title, even by a Council at *Conſtant. an.* 518. before the Biſhop of *Rome* had it publickly, or durſt own it: It was ſetled on the *Patriarch of Conſtantinople* to be called the *Oecumenical or Univerſal Patriarch*. Who knoweth not that Emperours gave ſuch Titles at their pleaſure? *Juſtinian* would ſometime give the Primacy to *Rome*, and at another time to *Conſtantinople*, ſaying [*Conſtantinopolitana Eccleſia omnium aliarum eſt caput*: *The Church of* Conſtantinople *is the Head of all other Churches.*] *An. Dom.* 530. *C. de Epiſcopis. l.* 1. *lege* 24. And it's known that this *Juſtinian*, that ſometime calls *Rome the Head*, did yet when the fifth General Council had condemned *Vigilius Pope of Rome*, permit *Theodora* his Empreſs to cauſe him to be fetcht to *Conſtantinople*, and drag'd about the ſtreet in a halter, and then baniſhed, till they had forc'd him to ſubſcribe and ſubmit to the Council:

Council: even as they had depoſed Pope *Silverius* his predeceſſor. And *Baronius* himſelf mentioneth a *Vaticane* Monument which as it calls *Agapetus* [*Epiſcoporum princeps*] on one ſide, ſo doth it call *Menna* [*the Apoſtolick Univerſal Biſhop:*] Which *Baronius* ſaith, doth mean no more than that he was *Univerſal over his own Provinces:* and if that be ſo, any Biſhop may be called *Univerſal.* And do not theſe men know what Council of *Carthage* decreed that the Biſhop *primæ ſedis* ſhould be called neither *Summus Sacerdos,* nor *Princeps Sacerdotum, vel aliquid hujuſmodi, ſed tantum Epiſcopus primæ ſedis:* i. e. *Not the chief Prieſt, or the chief of Prieſts, but the Biſhop of the firſt ſeat.* And how long will they ſhut their eyes againſt the Teſtimony of two of their own Popes, *Pelagius* and *Gregory* the firſt that condemned the name of *Univerſal Biſhop?*

Sometime they find the Church of *Rome* called *Apoſtolick,* and ſo were others as well as that, as is commonly known.

And ſometime the Pope is called the *Pillar of the Church*; And what of that? ſo are many others as well as he; as all the Apoſtles were as well as *Peter?* The Church is *built on the Foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets.* That the Paſtors of the Church were ordinarily called the *Pillars and props* of it, as by *Nicephorus, Gildas, Theodoret, Baſil, Tertullian, Dionyſius, Hierom, Auguſtine, &c.* you may ſee proved in *Gatakers Cinnus, page* 395, 396.

And laſtly, when the Papiſts read their Popes called the *Succeſſors of* Peter, they take this as a proof of their Soveraignty. Whereas 1. *Peter* himſelf had no ſuch Soveraignty. 2. They ſucceed him not in his Apoſtleſhip. 3. They are called *Pauls Succeſſors* as well as *Peters.* 4. *Others* are called *Peters Succeſſors* too as well as they, by the Fathers. 5. And other Biſhops

ordinarily are called the *Apoſtles Succeſſors*, and other Churches called *Apoſtolick Churches.*

I ſhall only ſet before them the words of one man at this time, *(Heſychii Hieroſol. apud Photium Cod.* 269.) and deſire them to tell me whether ever more were ſaid of the Pope, yea or of *Peter*, than he ſaith of *Andrew*, calling him *Chori Apoſtolici primogenitus, primitus defixa Eccleſiæ columna*, Petri Petrus, *fundamenti fundamentum, principii principium vel primitiæ ; qui vocavit antequam vocaretur, adduxit priuſquam adduceretur*] i. e. [*The firſt begotten of the Apoſtolick* Chore, *the firſt fixed Pillar of the Church ; the* Peter *of* Peter, *or the Rock of Peter, the Foundation of the Foundation ; the Principal of the Principal, who called before he was called, and brought (others) to (Chriſt) before he was brought to him (by any others.)*

And the ſame *Heſychius* ſaith of *James apud Photium Cod.* 275. [πῶς ἐγκωμιάσω, &c. i. e. *With what Praiſes may I ſet forth the ſervant and Brother of Chriſt, the chief Emperour (or Commander or Captain) of the New* Hieruſalem ; *the Prince or chief of Prieſts, the Preſident or Principal of the Apoſtles, the Crown or Leader among the Heads, the principal Lamp among the Lights ; the principal planet amongſt the Stars?* Peter *ſpeaketh to the people ; but* James *giveth the Law (or ſets down the Law)*] Can they ſhew us now where more than this is ſaid of *Peter* himſelf? Much leſs of the Pope?

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVII.

Detect. 18. ANother of the Principal Deceits of the Papists, is, *the forging and corrupting of Councils and Fathers, and the citation of such forgeries.* Be careful therefore how you receive their Allegations, till you have searched and know the Books to be genuine, and the particular words to be there, and uncorrupted.

They have by their greatness obtained the opportunity of possessing so many Libraries, that they might the easilier play this abominable game. But God in mercy hath kept so many monuments of Antiquity out of their hands, partly in the Eastern, and partly in the Reformed Churches, as suffice to discover abundance of their wicked forgeries and falsifications.

Of their forging Canons, yea feigning Councils that never were, (as *Concil. Sinuessan. Concil. Rom. sub Silvestr.*) See Bishop *Ushers Answer to the Jes. pag.* 12, 13. As also of their forging *Constantines Donation*, and *Isidore Mercators* forging of a fardel of Decretals; and of their falsifying and corrupting in the Doctrine of the Sacrament, the works of *Ambrose*, of *Chrysost.* (or the *Author operis Imperfecti,*) of *Fulbertus Bishop of Chartres*; of *Rabanus* of *Mentz*, of *Bertram*, or *Ratrannus*, &c. Read I pray you the words detecting their horrible impious cheats.

But their *Indices expurgatorii* will acquaint you with much more. And yet their secreter expurgations are worst of all.

What words of *Peters* Primacy, and others for their advantage, they have added to *Cyprian de unitate Ecclesiæ*, see in *Jer. Stephens* his Edition of it, where much

more additions to *Cyprians* works are detected out of many *Oxford* Manuſcripts.

Andreas Schottus the Jeſuite publiſhing *Baſils* works at *Antwerp* Lat. A.D. 1616. with Jeſuitical fidelity, left out the Epiſtle, in which is this paſſage following, which ſhould not be loſt: ſpeaking of the Weſtern Biſhops he ſaith [*verily the manners of Proud men do uſe to grow more inſolent, if they be honoured. And if God be merciful to us, what other addition have we need of? But if Gods anger on us remain, what help can the pride of the Weſt bring us? when they neither know the Truth, nor can endure to ſpeak it; but being prepoſſeſſed with falſe ſuſpicions, they do the ſame things now, which they did in the caſe of* Marcellus, *contentiouſly diſputing againſt thoſe that taught the truth, but for Hereſie, confirming it by their authority. Indeed I was willing (not as repreſenting the publick perſon of the Eaſt) to write to their Leader* (Damaſus) *but nothing about Church matters, but that I might intimate that they neither knew the truth of the things that are done with us, nor did admit the way by which they might learn them. And in general, that they ſhould not inſult over the calamitous and afflicted, nor think that Pride did make for their dignity, when that one ſin alone is enough to make us hateful to God*] ſo far *Baſil* in that Epiſtle left out by the Jeſuite; in which you may ſee the Roman power in thoſe dayes, in the conſciences of *Baſil* and ſuch other Fathers in the Eaſt.

And (by the way) how *Tertullian* reverenced them, you may ſee *lib. de pudicit. pag.* 742. where he calls *Zepherinus*, as we ſay, all to naught: And the *Aſian* Biſhops condemning of *Victor*, with *Irenæus* his reproof of him; *Cyprians* and *Firmilians* condemning *Stephen*: *Marcellinus* his condemnation by all: *Liberius* his being

ſo

ſo oft Anathematized by *Hilary Pictav.* The reſiſtance of *Zoſimus* and *Boniface* by the Africans, *&c.* ſhew plainly in what eſteem the now-infallible univerſal Head was then, among the Fathers and in all the Churches. But when the Papiſts come to the mention of ſuch paſſages, what juglings do they uſe? ſometime they ſilence them: ſometime they paſs them over in a few words that are buried in a heap of other matters: ſometime they bring in ſome forgeries to obſcure them. But commonly they make a noſe of wax of Councils and Fathers, as well as of Scripture, and put any ridiculous ſence upon them that ſhall ſerve their turns, though perhaps ſix men among them may have five or ſix Expoſitions.

An Epiſtle of *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* to *Auſtin* is forged by one, that their *Molanus* calleth *A barbarous impoſtor* (*Hiſtor. Imag. l.* 3. *c.* 36.) about the miracles of *Hierom*; where Purgatory and other errours are befriended. When as *Cyril* himſelf dyed thirty years before *Hierome*. And yet *Binsfield*, *Suarez* and other of the moſt learned Papiſts ſtick not to make uſe of this forgery for all that.

But it would be tedious to recite their particular forgeries. The ſtudious Reader may find many of them diſcovered up and down by Biſhop *Uſher* and other of our Writers. And for his fuller help, I adviſe him to read Dr. *Reignolds de Libris Apocryph.* and Dr. *Th. James* his corruptions of the Fathers, and *Sculletus* his *Medulla patrum:* yea of the Papiſts themſelves; read *Sixtus Senenſis* his *Bibliothec.* and *Bellarm. de Scriptorib. Eccleſ.* and *Poſſevines Apparatus*, and *Eraſmus* cenſures on the Fathers which he dealt with: But eſpecially let him not be without *Cooks cenſura Patrum*, and *Blondell on the Decretals*; to which alſo add *Rivets Critica Sacra*, and *Dallæus de Pſeudepigraphis.*

Of their abominable Legends I ſhall ſay nothing, but that the wiſer ſort of themſelves are aſhamed of them. And if any Ancients have abuſed the Church by ſhameleſs forgeries, the Papiſts make uſe of ſuch as confidently as if they were the word of God. For inſtance, Let any man but read over the Books of *Baſil* Biſhop of *Seleucia* (if it be his indeed) of the life and Miracles of *Thecla*, and try his faith upon it, whether he be able to believe that Thecla *ſtood ſo long at the window to hear* Paul *while all thoſe daily applications and orations were made to her? that* Demas *and* Hermogenes *were there to ſtir up the people againſt* Paul *as a deceiver, under the cloak of being his companions; that any of thoſe Orations recited are true, when the Author like a profeſſed fabler uſeth to ſay* [I ſuppoſe thus or thus they ſaid:] *that her Mother* Theoclæa, *and her lover* Thamiris *were on the ſudden ſo cruel as to burn her, while they are ſaid ſo much to burn in Love to her; that when* Thecla *had formed her body like a Croſs, and caſt her ſelf into the flaming pile, the flames in reverence of the Croſs, became as a Chamber to her, covering her like a vault from the peoples ſight, and not approaching her; and that the earth making a grievous noiſe, the ſhowrs and hail deſtroyed the people, and* Thecla *went her way without obſervance, finding* Paul *and* Oneſiphorus *hid in a Sepulcher at prayer for her: that* Paul *permitted her to cut her hair, and change her habit, and become his fellow travailer; that* Alexander *the Governour was ſo inflamed with her beauty at* Antioch, *even before ſhe came in full ſight of the people in the City Gate, that he could not forbear, but preſently muſt leap upon her like a mad dog; that ſhe tore his Cloak, and threw off his Crown, and ſo ſaved her Virginity; that for this ſhe was caſt and tyed to wild beaſts, and the Lyons couched to her, and one Lyoneſs fought for her, and killed*

the

the rest that assaulted her ; that yet they turned more upon her : that she leaped into the Fish-pond among the devouring Sea Calves ; and that fire from Heaven came down into the Water, and there made her a chamber, and saved her from those Sea-beasts ; that Falconilla*'s soul appeared to her Mother* Tryphæna *to beg* Thecla*'s prayers that she might be admitted into Heaven, telling her how much* Thecla *was admired in Heaven.* (She knew who was admired in Heaven before she could be let in:) that *at* Thecla*'s prayers she was admitted into Heaven ;* (but tells us not where she was before:) *that when* Thecla *was again tied to wild Bulls, and fire set to their posteriors to enrage them, the fire killed them, and burnt the bonds, and she was unhurt. That* Thecla *again puts on mans cloaths, and seeks* Paul ; (whether she wore breeches I find not ;) *that* Paul *hereupon pronounceth her an Apostle and ordaineth her to go and preach the Gospel: and appointeth her to one Pagan City* (as if either women were Apostles, or ordained to be preachers of the Gospel, that by *Paul* were forbidden to speak in the Church: or Apostles were confined to a City:) *that she fixed at* Seleucia, *and there converted and baptized many, and at last (after many miracles) did not die, but entred alive into the earth, which opened it self for her in the place where the holy Table stood ; that after her death she wrought those one and thirty miracles that fill a second Book, and many more ; appearing to this* Basil, *and encouraging him when he was weary, to go on in the writing of her praises, and plucking him by the ear, and so curing his head-ach, which else would have prevented his Oration in her praise the next day,* with abundance more that are more strange than this.

I have instanced but in this one case of *Thecla*, because it would be endless to tell you of all the rest of their fictions

fictions (were I acquainted with them all.) Nor do I mention this as one of their Legends, no nor as a piece of *Metaphraſtes*, but as the works of St. *Baſil* (not *Baſil* the great) an ancient Father. Now either this is *Baſils* work, or it is not. If it be not, then you ſee what truſt is to be given to the Papiſts Antiquities, and ſuppoſed Fathers: For this is one of them, and this ſtory vindicated by *Petrus Pantinus*, yea by no leſs a man than the Great *Baronius*, the Maſter of Antiquities, who *Annal. Tom.* 1. *ad An. D.* 47. bringeth a whole Army of Fathers to atteſt the Acts of *Thecla*, and approveth of this of *Baſils*, and the like of *Metaphraſtes*. Two Teſtimonies trouble him ſhrewdly. One is no later than *Tertullian*, who (*de Baptiſ. cap.* 18.) ſaith thus [*But if any women read the pretended writings of* Paul, *and defend the example of* Thecla, *for womens Liberty to teach and baptize, let them know that a Presbyter in* Aſia, *that framed that writing, putting* Pauls *name inſtead of his own, was caſt out of his place, being convicted of it, and confeſſing that he did it in love to* Paul.

The other is *Hieroms* teſtimony *de Script. Eccleſ.* who citing the fore-cited words, ſaith [*The travails therefore of* Paul *and* Thecla, *and the whole fable of the baptized Lyon, we reckon among Apocryphal writings: For how can it be that the inſeparable companion of the Apoſtle* (Luke) *was ignorant of this only among all his matters?*]

But yet *Baronius* thinks that theſe are not the ſame Books that *Tertullian* and *Hierom* ſpeak againſt: and why ſo? *Becauſe* 1. *Here is no mention of* Thecla's *Preaching and Baptizing, nor of the Lyon baptized.* 2. *Becauſe ſo many Fathers atteſt the ſtory.* But the firſt is a viſible falſhood, contrary to the expreſs words of the ſtory, which feign *Paul* to have ſent her to preach as a true Apoſtle, and mention her baptizing the people

of

of *Seleucia*. And for the *baptized Lyon*, perhaps *Hierom* ſpoke *de baptiſmate ſanguinis*: and meant the Lyon that dyed in the defence of *Thecla*: And in that place *Thecla* is brought as calling *Death a Baptiſm*: However that word which might eaſily be miſtaken, is no great diſproof that this is the ſame ſtory. And for the Fathers Teſtimony, as we believe that a famous Martyr called *Thecla* there was, from whence the occaſion of the ſtory roſe, ſo it doth but ſhew how unfit the Fathers are to be the Authors of our Faith, or to be eſteemed infallible, that ſo eaſily believe and recite the forged ſtories of an Aſiatick Presbyter, even when *Tertullian* had before revealed the deceit.

But if really this Book was written by *Baſil* of *Seleucia*, and was not ſpurious, then we yet further ſee, that they that reſt upon the Holy Scriptures alone for the matters of their faith, do take a ſurer wiſer way, than they that build all on the credit of ſuch credulous imprudent fabulous Fathers as this Author was.

By this little taſte you may ſee how their Records and Teſtimonies from Antiquity are to be truſted: Even as *Zoſimus* report of the Nicene Canon to the African Council was, who proved it a forgery, and ſo rejected it. When the writings are only in their keeping, and their intereſt calleth them to deprave them, they are little to be truſted; who dare venture to corrupt thoſe that are in the hands of the Chriſtian world.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVIII.

Detect. 19. ANother of the Popiſh devices is, *when they have laid their own cauſe upon ſo many forgeries, and uphold it by ſo many falſe reports, to make the people believe that it is we that are the lyars, and that we are not to be believed in any thing that we ſay of them, and that we miſreport the Fathers, belye the Roman Catholicks: and therefore no man ſhould read our Books, or diſcourſe with us, ſo as to afford us any credence.* So that indeed they get as much by meer perſwading the people that we are Lyars, as by any way that I know. We cannot tell them what is in their own Writers, but the ignorant people are commonly taught to ſay, *we ſlander them.* Though we cite the book, and page, and line, and tell them that they were printed at *Rome*, or *Colen*, or *Antwerp*, or *Paris*, by men of their own Profeſſion, yet they believe us not, for they are inſtructed to hold us for lyars, that we may be uncapable of doing them good. If we cite any of the Fathers, they tell us that we miſalledge them, or have corrupted them, or they ſay no ſuch thing. If we ſhew them the books publiſhed by their own Doctors, and licenſed by their Superiours, and printed by Papiſts, yet they will not believe us. And ſo they are taught the eaſieſt way in the world to repell the truth, and confute thoſe that would do them good. It is no more but ſay, *you lye*, and all's done.

In ſuch a caſe as this, what is there to be done? Ignorance and Incredulity thus purpoſely conjoyned, are the wall of braſs that is oppoſed to our endeavours. To what purpoſe ſhould we ſpeak to them that will not hear? In ſuch a caſe I know but one of theſe two wayes.

1. To

1. To endeavour to revive the ſtupified humanity and Reaſon of theſe men: and ask them, Is Religion the work of a man or of a beaſt? Of a wiſe man, or of a mad man? Is it a Reaſonable or an Unreaſonable courſe? If it be reaſonable, why then will you go without Reaſon upon other mens bare words? But if you are ſo little men as to venture your ſouls without Reaſon, me thinks you ſhould not venture againſt it? Would you reſt on the bare word of one of theſe men, if it went againſt Reaſon? If ſo, then you renounce your manhood. But ſuppoſe you will be ſo unreaſonable, yet I hope you have your five ſenſes ſtill? What if a Prieſt ſhall tell you that the Crow is white, and the ſnow is black, or that you ſee not when you know you ſee, will you believe him? If you will believe them before your eyes, and taſte, and feeling, then I have done with you. Who can diſpute with ſtocks and ſtones, or men ſo far forſaken of God, as to renounce all their ſenſes? But if you will not believe a Prieſt againſt your eyes, and other ſenſes, why then do you believe him that Bread is not Bread, and Wine is not Wine, when the eyes, and ſmell, and taſte of all men ſay it is? And if your ſenſes tell you that your Prieſts deceive you in one thing, me thinks you ſhould not be ſo confident of them in other things, as to believe and hearken to none but them.

2. If this will not ſerve, try whether you can procure their Prieſts to diſcuſs thoſe points before the incredulous people, that ſo they may hear both ſides ſpeak together. Get a conference between them, and ſome experienced judicious Divine. But this will hardly be obtained. For if it be to diſpute with one that is able, they'l preſently pretend a danger of perſecution; and no promiſe of ſecurity will ſatisfie them. But if it be a weak unexperienced man that challengeth

challengeth them, then they will venture, and take the advantage.

If nothing elſe can be done, it is the beſt way to offer them ſome ſmall Book againſt Popery to read. If they are ſo captivated that they will neither Hear nor Read, and their Leaders will not be drawn to a Diſpute, I know not what to do but leave them, and let them take what they get by their unreaſonable obſtinacy: They are unworthy of truth that ſet no more by it.

CHAP. XXIX.

Detect. 20. ANother of their deceits *is by pretended Miracles.* If they do but hear of a Wench that hath the *ſtrangulatus uteri*, or *furor uterinus*, or ſuch *hyſterical Paſſions* in any violent degree, they preſently go to caſt the Devil out of her, that ſo they may make deluded people think that they have wrought a Miracle. And uſually the Countrey people, and perhaps the diſeaſed woman her ſelf, may be ſo much unacquainted with the diſeaſe, as verily to believe the Prieſts, that they have a Devil indeed: and ſo turn Papiſts when the cure is wrought, as thinking it was done by the finger of God. The nature of this diſeaſe is to cauſe ſuch ſtrange ſymptoms, that moſt ignorant people that ſee them, do think that the perſons are either bewitched, or have a Devil. At this very time while I am writing this, I am put to diſſwade a man from accuſing one of his neighbours of witchcraft, becauſe his daughter hath this diſeaſe, and cryeth out of her. Leſt the Papiſts get further advantage by this ignorance of the people, I ſhall acquaint them briefly with ſome of the ſymptoms of this diſeaſe.

It

It usually seizeth upon young women between the Age of seventeen and thirty two years: And most commonly on those that are of a sound complexion, somewhat sanguine, or at least, fleshly and strong, and but seldom on the weaker sort (in this manner.) When it is but a meer strangulation, women commonly know it, by the rising to their throat, and swelling, and the like: But when it comes to the disease we mention, it causeth them to fall by fits into sudden trances, and swoons: in which at first usually they seem stupid as dead, if it be in a colder body; but after they grow to violent motions, and strivings, and ragings, so that it's as much as two can do to hold them. And when the fit is over, they are well again. Sometime there will be motions like convulsive in the head, the hands, and the fingers distinctly: so that you shall see one hand violently moved to some part of the body, so that it will be hard to remove it. Sometime one finger set double, and then another, and after that another, so that it will be hard till the fit is over to set them straight. Usually the body tost up and down with raging madness. And some of them will continue a year, or two, or seven in this case, daily falling into such fits as one would think should destroy or weaken them presently, and yet after the fits, be almost as well as ever, and their strength doth not much decay. If they hear any mention of a Witch, they will likely take a conceit that they are bewitched; and then in their fits they will cry out upon the Witch, and if they see her, they will fall into a fit. If they get but a conceit that they are Possessed with a Devil, (by hearing the mention of others that were possessed) they will by the power of corrupted fancy, play the parts of the possessed, and rage, and rore, and swear, and speak as in the person of the Devil, and take on them to prophesie, or tell of secrets. All this I have known:

and

and I have eaſed ſome of them by medicine in a few moments, and cured them (at that time) in a few dayes: So that I could eaſily have made the common people believe that I had caſt out a Devil, if I had but had the deſign and conſcience of a Papiſt. A while ago a neighbour Miniſter told me of a neighbour that was handled thus. I told him what diſeaſe it was, and adviſed him to perſwade her to a judicious Phyſitian. But the next I hear of her was, that neglecting the Phyſitian, ſhe was cured by ſome Papiſt Prieſt (I am aſhamed to tell you how) and thereupon was turned Papiſt. And no doubt but among themſelves it is reported for a Miracle.

The ſame courſe they take alſo in ſome diſtractions and other diſeaſes. And ſometime perſons are trained up by them to diſſemble and counterfeit a lunatick or poſſeſſed ſtate.

And here becauſe *H. T.* in his *Manual*, *pag.* 85, 86. doth plead their Miracles, I ſhall revive the memory of one of the great Miracles that was done among their Proſelytes in the Pariſh of *Wolverhampton*: though I have mentioned it heretofore. I have the Book by me (Printed at *London* by *F. K.* for *Will. Barret*, 1622.) and have ſpoke with many perſons that knew the Actor himſelf, being yet alive: ſo that I ſuppoſe that no Papiſt about *Wolverhampton* will deny it, what ever they do elſewhere.

At *Bilſon* in the Pariſh of *Wolverhampton* in *Staffordſhire* there was a Boy named *William Perry*, Son of *Tho. Perry*, who ſeemed to be bewitched or poſſeſſed with a Devil: (about thirteen years old, but of ſpecial wit above his age.) In his fits he ſeemed to be deaf, and blind, writhing his mouth aſide, continually groaning and panting, and when he was pricked, pinched, whipped, he ſeemed not to feel. He ſeemed to take no food that would digeſt, but with it caſt up rags, thred, ſtraw,

ſtraw, pins, *&c.* his belly almoſt as flat as his back, his throat ſwel'd and hard, his tongue ſtiff and rolled up towards the roof of his mouth, ſo that he ſeemed alwayes dumb, ſave that once in a fortnight or three weeks he would ſpeak a few words. It was thought he was bewitched by one *Joan Cocks*, becauſe 1. He would diſcern when that woman was brought into the room, though it were ſecretly done, as was tryed before the Grand Jury at *Stafford*. 2. He would not endure the repeating of the firſt verſe of *John* [*In the beginning was the word, &c.*] but other texts he would endure. When the Parents had been a while wearyed with him, and the Countrey flockt in to ſee him, a Prieſt of the Romiſh Religion was invited to cure him. The Prieſt exorciſed him, praying in Latine over him, hanging a ſtone about his neck, waſhing him with Holy water, Witch water, and anointing him with Holy Oyl, *&c.* which ſeemed to eaſe him, and make him ſpeak, and ſometime cure him for the time. They Hallowed all his meat and drink. He would not ſo much as eat Raiſins, or ſmell to flowers, unleſs they were bleſt by the Prieſt. He told them that while the Puritans ſtood by him he ſaw the Devil aſſault him in the ſhape of a black bird. The Prieſt requireth the chief fiend to ſhew himſelf: then the boy puts out his tongue ſwel'd. The Prieſt commandeth him to ſhew the People by the ſheet before him, how he would uſe thoſe that dyed out of the *Roman* Catholick Church: whereupon he pulls, and bites, and toſſeth the ſheet, till the people cry out and weep. Then he commandeth the Devil to tell him, how he did uſe *Luther*, *Calvin* and *John Fox*: and he playeth the ſame part more fiercely than before. Then the Prieſt commands him to ſhew what power he had of a good Catholick that dyed out of mortal ſin: and then he thruſt down his

arms, and hang'd down his dead, and trembled. The Boy promiſeth when his fit is over, that he will live and die a Catholick, perſwading his parents and friends, *&c.* On this manner three Prieſts one after another followed the cure, ſtill ſucceeding, but yet not curing him; that they might draw the Countrey to a longer obſervance of them, (and preacht to them in the houſe,) and that the Miracle might be the more famous. For forſooth there were many Devils in him, they ſaid, to be caſt out. And it ſtopt the cure, becauſe the Mother would not promiſe them to turn Papiſt if they cured him. But in the mean time the ſuppoſed Witch is brought to tryal at *Stafford* Aſſizes, 1620, before Judge *Warburton* and Judge *Davies*. But in the end the Judges deſired Biſhop *Morton* then preſent to take care of the Boy. Who took him home to his Caſtle at *Eccleſhall*, and after certain weeks time (the Biſhop being abroad,) the ſaid Biſhop comes to the Boy, and tells him that he underſtood that he could not endure the firſt verſe of *John*; And ſaith he, the Devil underſtandeth Greek as well as Engliſh, being a Scholar of almoſt ſix thouſand years ſtanding, and therefore he knows when I recite that verſe in Greek: And ſo calling for a Greek Teſtament, he read the 12 verſe, and the Boy thinking it had been the firſt, fell into his fit: And when that fit was over, the Biſhop read the firſt verſe, and then the Boy had no fit, thinking it had been ſome other verſe. And thus they proved him a deceiver, and the Boy was much confounded; but pretended more diſtraction: And then that he might get away, he complained of extream ſickneſs, and made water in the Urinal, as black as ink, groaning when he made it: But the third day after they eſpyed him mixing ink with his Urine, and nimbly conveying away the Inkhorn. And when they came in upon him,

and

and found him in the conveyance, he broke out into tears, and was suddenly cured; and confessed all, how he had been taught his art, and how he did all, and confessed that his intent was to be cured by a Priest, and to turn Papist (and whether they have catcht him again or no, I know not; for I hear he is a Quaker in *Bristol*, or at least a reviler of the Ministry.) The Bishop took his examination at large, *October* 8, & 13, 1620. If any doubt of the story, they may be satisfied yet by the Boy himself, or by any of the neighbours in *Bilson* that were at age there but thirty seven years ago.

But before the Bishop had discovered the knavery, one of the Conjuring Priests writes the Narrative of the business (which is printed with the rest), and is Entituled [*A Faithful Relation of the proceedings of the Catholick Gentlemen with the Boy of* Bilson, *shewing*, &c.] And they begin with [*Not to us O Lord, but to thy Name give the Glory!*] And so they proceed to make their report of it, for deluding the people, as a Miracle. And the writing was by a Papist Gentleman examined, attested upon Oath to be received from one Mr. *Wheeler*, &c. But when they heard of the Discovery, they were ashamed of their *faithful Relation*. At last, the Bishop brought the Boy at the next summers Assizes, *July* 26, 1621. to ask pardon openly of God, and the woman accused by him, and of the Countrey cheated by him, and there was an end of that Popish Miracle. Abundance more such I could give you out of certain records; but I recited this for the sake of *H. T.* and the Papists of *Wolverhampton*, where *H. Turbervile* hath lived.

And for your Miracles; I beseech you, if you regard not us, yet open your ears to a Jesuite that speaks the

Truth. *Joseph Acosta* (*de temporib. noviss. lib.* 3. *c.* 3.) [*To all the Miracles of Antichrist, though he do great ones, the Church shall boldly oppose the Belief of the Scriptures: and by the inexpugnable Testimony of this Truth, shall by most clear light dispel all his juglings as Clouds.* ——*Signs are given to Infidels, Scriptures to Believers; and therefore the Primitive Church abounded with Miracles, when Infidels were to be called: But the last, when the Faithful are already Called, shall rest more on the Scripture, than on Miracles. Yea I will boldly say, that all Miracles are vain and empty, unless they be approved by the Scripture; that is, have a Doctrine conform to the Scripture. But the Scripture* it self *is* of it self *a most firm Argument of Truth.*]

And the same *Acosta* confesseth in his *Indian History*, that *they do no Miracles in the Indies* (where the boast is.) And if they did, it would confirm Christianity, but not Popery.

Yea if Miracles be so much to be lookt at, why will you not give us leave to observe them? The same Miracles that you boast of, do testifie against you, if they be true. To instance now but in one. *Prosper* makes mention of a Miracle (which *Thyræus de Dæmoniac. pag.* 76, and many more of yours recite,) that was done by the *Sacramental Wine*: ☞ *A person possessed by the Devil was cured, (after many other means used in vain,) by the Drinking of the Wine in the Eucharist.* And doth not this Miracle justifie us that give the people the Wine, and condemn you, that refuse to give it them? Many other Miracles I could recite, that the Fathers say were done by the Sacrament in both kinds received, which condemn you that forbid it.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXX.

Detect. 21. ANother of the Papists wayes of deceiving is, *by impudent Lyes and Slanders against their Adversaries; which they vent with such confidence, that the seduced people easily believe them.* They that are taught to believe their Priests against their own seeing, hearing, feeling, tasting and smelling, must needs believe the vilest Lyes that they are pleased to utter, in cases where the miserable people are unable to disprove them. I will give you but a few of that multitude of Instances that might be given.

1. In a Manuscript of the Papists which I lately received from a Neighbour of *Sturbridge*, as sent from *Wolverhampton*, there are these words, with which they conclude [*Luther having richly supped, and made his friends merry with his facete conceits, died the same night. This is testified by* Cochleus *in vita* Lutheri. *And* John Calvin, *a branded Sodomite, consumed with lice and worms, died blaspheming and calling upon the Devil. This is registred by* Schlusselburge *and* Bolseck. *These were the Ends of the Parents of the Protestant and Presbyterian pretended Reformed Religions.*

And as if their own tongue must sentence them to Hell, in the very words before they say [*All Lyars, their part shall be in the pool burning with fire and brimstone, which is the second death,*] and so make Application of it to the Protestants, as being Lyars; and when they have done, conclude with the two forecited impudent Lies of *Luther* and *Calvin*. The like words of *Calvin* hath the late Marques of *Worcester*

(or Dr. *Baily* for him) in his Papers to King *Charles*; the whole writing being ſtuffed with ſuch impudent Lies, that one would wonder that humane nature ſhould be capable of ſuch wickedneſs, and that the ſilly people ſhould ſwallow down ſuch heaps of falſhood. And it is not theſe two alone, but multitudes of Papiſts that have written theſe Lies of *Luther* and *Calvin*. *Thyræus* the Jeſuite in his Book *de Dæmoniacis*, *part.* 1. *cap.* 8. *pag.* 21, tells us this ſtory: [*that the ſame day that* Luther *dyed*, *there was at* Gheola *a Town in* Brabant *many perſons poſſeſſed of Devils*, *that waited on their Saint* Dymna *for Deliverance*, *and were all that day delivered: but the next day they were all poſſeſſed again*; *whereupon the Exorciſt or ſome body asked the Devils where they had been the day before*; *and they anſwered*, *that they were commanded by their Prince to be at the Funeral of their fellow Labourer* Luther. *And for proof of this*, Luthers *own ſervant that was with him at his death*, *looking out at the window*, *did more than once*, *to his great terror*, *ſee a company of ugly ſpirits leaping and dancing about without: and alſo that the Crows followed the Corps all the way with a great noiſe.*]

O wonderful patience and mercy of God, that ſuffereth ſuch abominable Lyars to live, and doth not cauſe ſome ſudden vengeance to befal them! Reader, I will tell thee now the caſe of theſe two ſervants of Chriſt that are thus reviled (even as their Maſter was before them, that was ſaid to do Miracles by the power of the Devil.)

As for *Luther*, he was often taken with a great pain in his breaſt, about the mouth of the ſtomach, and thought his Death when it came would be ſudden; which made him ſay, [*Feri Domine*, *feri clementer*, *quia ipſe paratus ſum: Strike Lord*, *ſtrike mercifully*, *for*

for I am ready] Having preached his last Sermon at *Wittenberge*, *Jan.* 17, he took his journey the 23, to Count *Mansfields* Countrey, whither he was called. When he came thither, he was grown so weak, that they almost despaired of his life; yet by the use of fomentations he had so much ease, as that he preached sometime, and did other work from *Jan.* 29, to *Febr.* 17. The last day of his life, though he was weak, yet he sate at the table with them, and at Supper his discourse was upon the Question, Whether we shall know one another in Heaven? Which he affirmed and proved, in that *Adam* knew *Eve* as soon as he saw her, that she was flesh of his flesh: and therefore much more shall we know one another in Heaven, *&c.* After Supper, he withdrew himself as he used, for private prayer; but the pain of his breast increased on him. When he had taken a medicine, he lay down on a Couch and slept sweetly two hours, and then went to his Chamber, saying to those about him [*Pray God to preserve the Doctrine of the Gospel to us; for the Pope and Council of* Trent *have strange Contrivances.*] When he was laid down and had slept a while he awakened, and found by the increase of his pain, that he was near his End, and spoke to God as followeth in their hearing [*O my heavenly Father, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the God of all Consolation, I thank thee that thou hast revealed to me thy Son Jesus Christ, in whom I have believed, whom I have professed, whom I have loved, whom I have Celebrated (or Honoured), whom the Pope of* Rome *and the rest of the rabble of the ungodly do persecute and reproach: I beseech thee O my Lord Jesus Christ receive my soul. O my heavenly Father, though I am taken from this life, and though my body must now be laid down, yet I know certainly that I shall abide with thee for ever, and that none can take*

me out of thy hands.] Then he said [*So God loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life.*] Then he repeated part of the 68. *Psalm*: and when he had drunk a medicine that was given him, he said [*I go hence: I now return my spirit unto God,*] presently adding [*Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit, thou hast redeemed me O God of Truth.*] And so he dyed as if he were setting himself to sleep, without any sign of further pain: But when they saw him dying, Dr. *Jonas* and *Calius* cryed to him [*Reverend Father; do you die constant through Christ in his Doctrine which you have hitherto preached?*] And he answered [*Yea,*] and never spoke more. When he was dead (at *Islebe*) *Count Mansfield* would have kept his body, but the *Duke of Saxony* would not suffer him, but caused it to be brought back to *Wittenberge*, and there with great solemnity interred.]

This is the true report in brief of *Luthers* Death, delivered to the world by those that stood by him, and were eye-witnesses. And yet these impudent Lying Papists have perswaded their followers that the Devils were seen dancing about him, that when he should be buryed there was a horrible thunder, and the body was taken away out of the Coffin by the Devil, and a stink of Brimstone left behind; with more such stuff as this, which they have printed, and which one would think the Father of Lies should be ashamed of.

And for *Calvin*, not only those before mentioned, but also *Bolsecus*, *Surius*, *Prateolus*, *Demochares*, *Lindanus*, *Sanctesius*, *Cahiernus*, and others publish to the world, not only that he was an Epicure, but a Sodomite, and was burnt on the shoulder for Sodomie with a hot iron at *Noviodunum* where he was born.

Yea

Yea *Leſſius* the Jeſuite impudently calls Chriſt to witneſs, that ſhall judge all men according to their works, that he doth not deviſe theſe things of his own brain, but from good Authors, and forty years currant fame. And his Authors are theſe Papiſts, *Bolſecus*, *Brigerus*, *Stapleton*, *Campian*, *Duræus*, *Surius*, and *Reginaldus*. Hath Hell any greater calumnies than theſe to fill the mouths or writings of men withall?

Reader, I ſhall ſhew thee what credit theſe men are of by this inſtance. As for the time when they ſay he was ſtigmatized for Sodomie, it was when he was a Papiſt, and therefore if it had been true, it had been a greater diſhonour to them than to us. But it's a meer forgery of the Devil and a Fryer. *Hierom Bolſeck* a Fryar, ſeemed to turn Proteſtant, and coming to *Geneva*, he began to preach the Pelagian Doctrine there, and openly contend againſt the Paſtors in the Congregation; and being confounded by *Calvin*, the Magiſtrates impriſoned him, and baniſhed him for ſedition. Then he betakes himſelf to the neighbour Towns, to play the ſame game there: but the Magiſtrates of *Bern* alſo baniſh him out of their Countrey. Whereupon he turned Papiſt again, and when *Calvin* was dead, he wrote all theſe abominable lies of him. And all the reſt (with *Schluſſelburgius* the Lutheran, an enemy of *Calvin*'s) do take up the report from this one Lying heretical Papiſt: and ſo it becomes a currant fame with them, as if it were as true as the Goſpel. Whereupon our writers call to them, provoke them, challenge them to ſearch the Records at *Noviodunum*, where they ſay the thing was done, and prove that ever there was ſuch a thing, or elſe bear the open ſhame of Lyars. But they can bring no proof, but call on us to diſprove it. When the City are Papiſts, and haters

of

of *Calvin*. But after all this, as God would have it, the Papist Dean of that City, called *Jacobus le Vasseur*, publisheth at *Paris*, 1633. the Annals of their Cathedral Church, and therein pouring out his hatred against *Calvin*, and saying what he can against him, doth yet out of their records clear him of all these accusations, and lets the world know that there was never any such thing, and that they had no crime at all against him, but that he turned from the Papists; and that the Major or chief Governour of the City went away with *Calvin*, when he was forced to fly from his native Countrey. He recites all the passages of *Calvins* life there, but professeth that they had no more against him. Thus God confounded the Lying Papists by one of themselves, and the Records of that City, where they said the thing was done. And yet they believe one another, and carry on the Lye to this day. O how desirable is the day of judgement!

Mr. *Rob. Amstrowther*, Chaplain to the King of *Englands* Embassador with the Emperour, being at *Vienna*, heard the Jesuites and others repeating confidently this slander of *Calvin*: Whereupon he opened to them this Evidence against it, and satisfied them of the falshood: so that they told him, they never knew so much before, and promised him they would never mention it more.

If any would see the very words of their own Records, and Doctor *Vasseur*, he may read them in *Rivets Sum. Contr.* against *Baily*, and again in his *Jesuita Vapulans*, *Cap.* 2.

And as for the life of *Calvin* after he forsook the Papists, if you will but believe that the City of *Geneva*, and all the Ministers and others that were about him, in his life and at his death, did know better than *Bolseck*, a fugitive Apostate Papist that was his enemy,

enemy, and then far off, you may ſee at large in *Melchior Adamus*, and *Beza*, the deſcription of ſuch a ſhining burning light as *Rome* hath not to boaſt of. He was a man of admirable wit, judgement, induſtry, and piety. When he had forſaken his own Country for the Goſpel ſake, and taken up in *Geneva*, and planted the Goſpel there, with *Farellus* and *Viretus*, at laſt the ungodly part getting the Head, the Miniſters were baniſhed. And ſo he ſetled in another City. The four Bayliffs of *Geneva* that baniſhed the Miniſters, within two years were ruined by the judgements of God. One of them accuſed of ſedition, ſeeking to ſcape through a window, fell, and was broken to death. Another was put to death for murder. The other two being accuſed of Mal-adminiſtration, fled and were condemned. *Calvin* is ſent for; and intreated to return to *Geneva:* which by importunity, and *Bucers* perſwaſion, he yieldeth to. There was he continually moleſted by the ungodly, and loved by the good. The Malignants whom he would reſtrain by Diſcipline from Whoredom, drunkenneſs, and other wickedneſs, were ſtill plotting or raging againſt him, and called their Dogs by his name. But ſhame was ſtill the end of their attempts. His revenge was to tell them [*I ſee I ſhould have but ſorry wages if I ſerved man: but it's well for me that I ſerve him that alway performeth his promiſes to his ſervants.*] As for his work, he preached every day in the week each ſecond week, and beſides that, he read three dayes a week a Divinity Lecture. And every Thurſday he guided the Presbyterie; and every Friday at a meeting he held an Expoſitory conference and Lecture: ſo that the whole came to almoſt twelve Sermons a week. Beſides this, he wrote Epiſtles to moſt Countries of Chriſtendom (in *Europe*) to Princes, Divines and others; And he

he wrote all those great volumes of most Learned judicious Controversies, Commentaries, and other Treatises, which one would have thought might have been work enough for a man that had lived an hundred years, if he had done no other. And many Hereticks he confuted, and some convinced and reduced. ☞ He set up among the Ministers a course of teaching every Family from house to house, of which he found incredible fruit. For all this his labour he endured the affronts, contradictions, and reproaches of the rabble, yea and sometime hath been beaten by them. Because he would not administer the Sacrament to ungodly men, that were rulers in the place, he was at first banished, and after threatned, and continually molested by them, and railing fellows set to preach and write against him. And whether he were an Epicure, you may soon judge: He alwayes used a very spare dyet: and for ten years before his death did never taste one bit, but at supper, as his constant course: so that every day was with him a better fast then the Papists use to make on their fasting dayes. By this extream labour, speaking, and fasting, and watching (for he dictated his writings as he lay in bed much,) he overthrew his body; and falling first into a Tertian, and then into a Quartan, after that he fell into a Consumption, with the gout and stone, and spitting of blood, and the disease in the Hemorrhoid veins, which at last ulcerated by over-much fasting, speaking, and use of Aloes; besides the head-ach which was the companion of his life. In these sicknesses he would never forbear his labour, but when he was perswaded to it, he told them, that he could not bear an idle life. And when he was near to death was still at work, asking those that intreated him to forbear, *Whether they would have God find him idle?* Under all these pains of Gout, Stone,

Stone, Collick, Head-ach, Hemorrhoids, Consumption, *&c.* those that were about him testified to the world, that they never heard him speak a word unbeseeming a patient Christian. The worst was that oft repeated word [*How long, Lord! How long!*] as being weary of a miserable world. Witnesses he had enough; for he could scarce have rest for people crowding to him to visit him. On *Mar.* 23, he went among the Ministers to their Meeting, and took his farewel of them there. The next day he was wearyed by it: But the twenty seventh day he was carryed to the Court, to the Senate of the City; where he made a speech to them, and took his farewel of them, with many tears on both sides. *April.* 2, he was carryed to Church, and staid the Sermon, and received the Sacrament. Afterward the Senate of the City came to him, and he made an heavenly Exhortation to them. On *April* 25, he dictated his Will, which I would his slanderers would read. His Library it self, and all his goods being prized, came scarce to three hundred Crowns. *May* 11, he wrote his farewel to *Farellus*. *May* 19, all the Ministers came to him, with whom he sate, and did eat, and cheerfully take his leave of them. On the twenty seventh of *May* his voice seemed to be stronger, and so continued till his last breath that day, which was with such quietness as men compose themselves to sleep. The next night and day the City Magistrates, Ministers, Scholars, people and strangers, were taken up in weeping and lamentation. Every one crowded to see the Corps, among whom the Queen of *England*'s Embassadour to *France* was one. He was buryed according to his desire in the common Church-yard, without any Monument or Pomp.

And

And hath left behind him ſuch a Name, as in deſpight of all the Devils in Hell, and all the Papiſts on earth, ſhall be precious till the coming of Chriſt: and ſuch writings hath he left as are the comfort of the Diſciples of Truth, and the ſhame of the reproaching Adverſaries.

Reader, this is that *Calvin* that is ſo hated by the bad, and loved and honoured by the good: whom theſe Papiſts have called an *Epicure* and *Sodomite*, and ſaid *that he died blaſpheming, and calling upon the Devil, and was eaten with lice and worms.* Is not God exceeding patient, that will ſuffer ſuch wretches to live on the Earth? What man could they have named ſince *Auguſtine*, yea ſince the Apoſtles dayes, that was more unfit for ſuch a ſlander than *Calvin?* Yet becauſe one man, *Bolſeck*, that was baniſhed, and turned Papiſt, and lived then I know not in what Countrey, hath written theſe things againſt him, the reſt of them, even as much as the late Marqueſs of *Worceſter*, take them up as confidently, as if the infallible Chair had uttered them.

But yet if thou think this Enemy *Bolſeck* is more to be believed than thoſe that lived with *Calvin*, and the City of *Geneva*, that had continual acceſs to him, I will give thee ſuch a Teſtimony, as ſhall ſhame the Papiſts that have a ſpark of modeſty. Hear then what other Papiſts themſelves ſay, that knew better what they ſaid, or made more Conſcience of their words.

Florimundus Raimundus a Papiſt of Burdeaux (or the Jeſuite *Richeome* that wrote in his name,) writing for the Pope and againſt *Calvin*, hath theſe words of him. [*Under a dry and lean body he had a ſharp and lively wit; ready in anſwering; bold in attempting; a great faſter; even from his youth, whether for his health*

health to overcome the head-ach, or for his ſtudies —— There is ſcarce a man found that ever matched Calvin *in Labours: For the ſpace of twenty three years, in which he remained in the Epiſcopacy of* Geneva, *he preached every day once, and twice on the Lords day oftimes. And every week he read publick Lectures of Divinity (beſides,) and every Friday he was at the conference of the Paſtors: The reſt of his time he ſpent either in writing Books, or anſwering letters.*]

Readet, is this Teſtimony from a Papiſt like the reſt? But yet thou ſhalt have more. *Papirius Maſſonius* a Learned Papiſt, and Scholar to *Baldwin* one of *Calvins* Enemies, wrote *Calvins* life; and he ſaith of him, [*No day almoſt paſſed in which he did not preach to the Citizens. Thrice every eight dayes, as long as he lived, he profeſſed (or publickly taught) Divinity (in the Schools;) being Laborious, and alwayes writing or doing ſomething. —— Of a weak body, but worn by watchings, reading, writing, meditations, diſeaſes, buſineſſes, preachings. He took very little ſleep; and therefore much of his works he dictated in bed to his ſervant that wrote them from his mouth. He did eat but once a day: and confeſſed that he found not a more preſent or ſurer Remedy for his weakneſs of ſtomach and head-ach. His cloathing was of ſmall price, to cover him rather than adorn him.* —— *At* Worms *and* Ratisbone *he exerciſed the ſtrength of an excellent wit with ſo great applauſe of the Germane Divines, that by the judgement of* Melanchthon *and his Aſſociates, by a peculiar priviledge, he was called* The Divine. *He wrote as much and as well any man of the contrary parties, whether you reſpect number, acuteneſs, language, ſharpneſs, emphaſis, or ſubtilty. Not a man of all his Adverſaries, whether Catholicks, Anabaptiſts, Lutherans, Arians, or the forſakers of his Party, that wrote againſt*

against him, did seem to match him, in gravity of writing, and weight of words, and sharpness in answering his principles. He almost terrified Pighius *himself discoursing of free will, and* Sadaletus.] These are the words of a Learned Papist.

But this is not all. Abundance of Papists tell us of a story how *Calvin* hired one in *Geneva* to take on him to be dead, that he might have the honour of raising him from the dead. This the Jesuite *Thyræus de Dæmoniacis* writes, and many others, and it goes among them for a currant truth; and all from the report of *Bolseck*. But, as God would have it, *Pap. Massonius* confuteth this also, and saith, that his *Master* Baldwinus *knew nothing of it, who lived at* Geneva, *and after turned Papist, and* Calvins *enemy*: and other reasons he giveth to disprove this and the other slanders that were raised of *Calvin*; saying, that *they were but* scriptores plebeii, maledicendi studio, *&c. vulgar Writers, that study or love, to reproach or speak evil, that vend these things.* And so much shall serve against the Papists Lies against *Luther* and *Calvin*.

If you would see more of that heap of Lies confuted, which the Marques of *Worcester* gave in to King *Charles*, read Mr. *Chr. Cartwright's* Reply to them, where part of them (and but part) are detected.

And as they have done by these, so by others also. When *Beza* was eighty years of age, a false report came to the Papists that he was dead: Whereupon *Claudius Puteanus* with his *Jesuitical* Companions wrote a Book, that at his death he turned Papist and renounced his Religion. So that the old man (that lived seven years longer,) was fain himself to write against them, to prove that he was not dead, nor turned Papist. These be the means by which men are reconciled to the Church of *Rome*.

They

They have printed also a story that *Calvins* own Son being bitten by a mad dog, was sent by his Father to one of their Saints Images for Cure, when no other means would serve; and being cured, he turned Papist: When as the world knew that *Calvin* never had a Son. Also they tell us of a saying of *Luthers*, that [*This Cause was not begun in the Name of God, nor will it be ended in the Name of God.*] This *Luther* spoke of *Eckius* and the other Papists, as himself professeth in his Answer to *Eurferus*, *Tom.* 1. *fol.* 404. And these shameless Lyars confidently publish that he spoke this of himself, as the Marquess of *Worcester* to King *Charles* did.

Another saying of his they as impudently abuse, *viz.* [*If the Wife will not, let the Maid come,*] perswading the world, that *Luther* would have a man lye with his Maid, if his Wife refuse: Whereas he only labours to prove, that Desertion is a sufficient cause of divorce: and that if the Wife refuse, she should be warned again and again, before others and the Judges, and in Case of utter refusal and desertion, *Vasthi* may be rejected, and *Hester the Maid taken to Wife*: Which many a Papist is ready to justifie.

Yea they annex that *Luther* would have men *Contain but five dayes*: When as he vehemently detesteth it, and urgeth the contrary, telling them that God no doubt will enable them to be Continent, if they will use his Means, *Tom.* 5. *serm. de Matrimon.* They forgot that the 5. suppositious Epist. of their *Clement* pleading for the Community of all things, adds [*In omnibus autem sunt sine dubio & Conjuges*] [*Among these All no doubt but Wives and Husbands are contained.*]

Of the horrid Lyes of *Genebrard*, *Possevine*, and other Papists against *Peter Martyr*, *Beza*, *Calvin* and others, see Dr. *Reynolds ad Anglica: Seminar.*

ante lib. de Idololatria Rom. Eccl. §. 5. pag. 20, 21, 22, 23.

When the fall of their house at *Black-fryars* had killed their Priests, and such abundance of the people that were hearing him in the midst of the Sermon; they Printed a Book to perswade the people beyond sea, that it was a company of the Heretieks or Puritans, that were killed at the hearing of one of their Preachers. Dr. *Gouge* tells you when and where it was printed, and many read it.

When the Gunpowder Plot was in hand, they had contrived presently to give it all abroad that the Puritans did it. Read Mr. *Samuel Clark* of it, in his *Mirror of Gods Judgements, Fol.* and you shall find this fully detected.

When *Fisher* the Jesuite had held his conference with Dr. *Featly* and Dr. *White*, there being present two Earls; one of them (the Earl of *Warwick*) having business shortly after beyond sea, fell unknown into Dr. *Westons* company, at Saint *Omers*, who presently tells it him for news, how *Fisher* had confounded the Protestant Doctors, and that two Earls and so many people were turned by it to the Church of *Rome*; not knowing that he that heard him was one of the two Earls, and that there were not so many people there, and how they were confirmed against Popery by that Dispute. And when the Earl of *Warwick* brought home this jeast, Dr. *Weston* hearing what sport was made with it in *England*, writ a simple excuse for his Lying: Which I have at hand, but find it had been better for him to have said nothing.

Should I recite but half the forgeries of this nature, by which the Priests and Jesuites cheat the poor people, I must be voluminous.

But alas, their very worship of God is much of it composed of Lyes, and is not that like to be acceptable worship?

worship? How their Offices and Legends are stuft with fictions, *Canus* and many of their own confess. And *Cassander* saith, *that so few of the reliques in all* Germany *would be found true ones if examined, that its better quite take off the people from the veneration of them:* Instancing in one of old, that was worshipped as a Saint, and upon enquiry was found to be the bones of a Thief.

Agobardus Bishop of *Lyons* (saith *Usher*) complained about eight hundred years ago, that the *Antiphonary used in his Church had many ridiculous and phantastical things in it: and that therefore he corrected much of it; cutting off what seemed superfluous, or light, or lying, or blasphemous. Agobard. ad Cant. Lugd. de Correct. Antiphon. pag.* 396. And not long since *Lindanus* made the like complaint, that [*Not only Apocryphal matters out of the Gospel of* Nicodemus *and other toyes are thrust in, but even the secret prayers, (yea, alas for shame and grief, the very Canon varying, and redundant) are defiled with most filthy faults.*]

Reader, I will trouble thee no more with stirring in this puddle: but only warn thee, as thou loveſt thy soul, trust it not on the bare reports of such Lyars, but try before thou trust; and give not up thy sense and Reason to men that make so little, or so ill a use of their own. If thou refuse this Counsel; say not but thou wast warned.

CHAP. XXXI.

Detect. 22. ANother of their Deceits is by *quarrelling with our Translations of the Bible*, and making the people believe that we have so corrupted it, that it is none of the word of God; and so they openly scorn it, and deride it.

As to this point, though Learned men can soon confute them by vindicating the Text as in the Original Languages, and then vindicating our Translation; yet the common disputant need not put them and himself to so much trouble. If really they will but let the Law of God contained in the Holy Scripture be the Rule by which our difference shall be tryed and decided, we will cut short the rest of the controversie; and take it wholly together; and we will stand to the Vulgar Latine, which is it that themselves applaud. We are content that this be the Rule between us. Yea, rather than they shall shift off the unlearned by these tricks, we will admit of their own Translation, which the Rhemists have (with little friendship to our cause) composed. Only we must intreat them that their Commentaries and conceits be not taken into the Text as part of the Word of God. So that this quarrel is quickly at an end. The Scripture is so full against them, that no Translation that makes it not another thing, can make it to be on their side.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXII.

Detect. 23. ANother of the Designs of the Papists is, *to bring all the faithful Pastors of the Churches into contempt, or suspicion at least, with the People, that so they may draw them to refuse our helps, and the Papists may deal with them alone, whom they know they are easily able to over-reach.* Though our people have not that absolute Dependance upon their Teachers as theirs have, yet an ordinate Dependance is Necessary to them, or else God would never have appointed Teachers and Pastors for his Church. The Papists dare not trust their followers so much as to read a Bible in their vulgar tongue: Much less to Read our writings against their errours and impieties. No nor their Priests and Fryars ordinarily to read them: No nor commonly to read the writings of their own Party: No nor those, nor the strongest of those that are written against us: for fear lest the objection should prove too hard for the answer; or lest they should understand the truth of our doctrine in some measure. Sr. *Edw. Sands* in his *Europæ Specul.* professeth how hard he found it, to meet with the Works of *Bellarmine* himself in any Book-sellers shop in *Venice* or other parts of *Italy:* But our people have all leave to keep and read the Papists writings. We dare venture them upon the light upon equal terms: But yet we know them to be insufficient, for the most part, to defend even plain and necessary truths, against the Cavils of adversaries that overmatch them in learning and other abilities. Now lest we should but afford them our assistance, the Papists principal design is to bring them into false conceits of the Ministers, and make us odious to them;

that they may neglect our help, and the easilyer hearken to other Teachers. And if they can but prevail in this design, the day is their own, and the souls of our unhappy people are like to be undone.

And the more is it to be feared, lest at last they should this way prevail, both because of the sin that lyeth on our selves in too reserved and negligent a doing of our work; and because of the great obstinacy and unprofitableness of the people, that hate the light, and unthankfully despise it, or will not obey it, and work by it while they may.

The designs of the Papists against the Ministry are these. 1. They principally endeavour to delude the Rulers of the Land, and set them against them: Of which more anon.

2. They are very busie to procure an overthrow of their established maintenance: To which end they animate all sects to rail against Tythes.

3. They labour by scoffs and nicknames to make them odious. As they were the Authors or chief fomenters of the old scorn under the name of *Puritans*, so are they of many more of late. If in Court, or Parliament, City or Countrey, you hear men set themselves of purpose to scorn or vilifie the Ministry, it's very probable that they are either secret Papists, or their deluded servitors. If they speak of men that regard the Ministry, and be not hardened as they to a despising of Christ in his servants, they call such [*Priest-ridden*;] and the Pastors they scornfully call [*Jack-Presbyters*, *Divines*;] and many other scoffs are at hand, to serve the ends of the Devil and the Pope, by alienating the Affections of the people from their Teachers, that so they may devour them at pleasure.

4. Ano-

4. Another of their wayes of reproach is, by telling the people what odious divisions are among us, and how many minds we are of, and how oft we change; and such like reproaches, by their mouthing it, they can make something of. While they never tell them how much more changeable they have been, and what divisions are among themselves, incomparably beyond all ours. Nor do they ever tell them how far we are united, and how small the differences among us are, and such as must be expected while we all know but in part.

5. Another reproach that the Papists cast on the Ministry, is Greedines, Covetousnes, and being hirelings. And therefore they put these into the mouths of Quakers and other Sectaries. And what's their ground? Forsooth because we take Tythes, or other set maintenance. Because we have food and rayment, and our daily bread. I have said enough of the Cause it self in my several writings against the Quakers. If any doubt whether the Papists be their Teachers, or of the same mind, besides many greater Evidences, the Manuscript from *Wolverhampton* before mentioned may be full satisfaction. This tells men that [*for filthy lucre sake we scratch itching ears with doctrines of liberty*.] and thus it learnedly versifieth,

With Pleasing words they scratch all ears that itch,
That Mammon *(whom they serve) may make them rich.*
For they are Mercenaries, that will be hir'd
To preach what doctrines are by men desir'd.

Answ. I must profess unfeignedly that the experience of such horrid wickedness of men, is a great help to my faith against all temptations that ever would provoke me to doubt whether there be a Hell; when I see

and hear that unreasonable villany, that I should scarce have believed humane nature could have been capable of, if God or such experience had not told it me: But when I see Abominations before my eyes as incredible or horrid as Hell it self almost, it silenceth temptations to such unbelief.

Reader, I will give thee a brief comparison between the Papists Priests and the Ministers of Christ, that thou mayst see whether these men be fit to rail at us as Mercenaries, and such as are the servants of Mammon.

It's a well known case that the Ministers of this Land, and of all the Reformed Churches commonly, do many of them want necessaries, and some want food and rayment, and the rest of them for the most part have little more. Or if one of an hundred have two hundred pounds a year, it's ten to one but taxes and other payments bringeth it so low, that he hath no superfluities. And some that have not Wives or Children, do give all that they can gather to the poor. And some upon my knowledge give more to charitable uses, than they receive for the work of their Ministry, living on their own means. This is the height of their Covetousness and Ambition, as you call it.

And now will you take a view of the Popish Clergy, for Greatness, Riches, and Numerousness. 1. For Greatness; the Pope who is their chief Priest, pretendeth to the Government of all the Christian world. Emperours and Kings have kist his feet, and held him the stirrup. One Emperour was forced to wait bare foot at his Gates a long time in patience, till he pleased to open them. Another being forced to prostrate himself to him, the Pope set his foot upon his neck, profanely abusing the words of the *Psal.* (91. 13.) *He shall tread on the Lyon and Adder*, &c. Divers Princes hath he deposed. He hath claimed a Supremacy in

Temporals

Temporals and Spirituals, and his more moderate flatterers subject Princes to him *in ordine ad spiritualia.* General Councils approved by him, decree that he shall Excommunicate and depose Princes, that will not extirpate those that he calleth Hereticks, and shall commit the Government to others, or give their Countreys to the first that can seize on them, and absolve all their Vassals from their Allegiance, (in despight of Oaths and Gods Commands.) He is a Temporal Prince himself, having large Dominions. He hath so numerous a Clergy in the Countreys of all Popish Princes, as makes him great and formidable to them. His Cardinal Priests are equal to Princes, and greater than many Princes are. 2. And, for their Riches and Numbers; to say no more of their Pope and Cardinals, they have such multitudes of Arch-bishops, Bishops, Priests, Abbots, Priors, Fryars, Jesuites, and such others, as take up a great part of the Land where they live. I will at this time give you but one Instance, and desire you to compare it with our Ministers and their maintenance: and that is of the Popish Clergy in *France.*

Their own writers tell us as followeth *Bodin* (a Judge in *France*) saith, (as *Heylin Geograph. pag.* 148. reciteth it) *That the Revenues of the Clergy there are twelve millions, and three hundred thousand livres, which is one million and two hundred thousand pounds of our English money* per annum; *and that they possess seven parts of twelve of the whole revenue of the Kingdom, which is above half.* But we will take up with the lower reckoning of the Book called *Comment. de stat.* and saith *Heylin*, this tells us that *the Clergy have near a fourth part of the very Lands of all the Kingdom; besides the Offerings, Churchings, Burials, Diriges, and such like Casualties, which amount to as much as their Rents,* (so that there is another fourth part,

part, which comes to half the Kingdom :) upon which Sr. *Edwin Sands* computes their revenue at *six millions yearly.* And for the number; that one Kingdom hath *thirteen Arch-biſhops,* an *hundred and four Biſhops,* a *thouſand four hundred and fifty Abbies, five hundred and forty Arch-priories, twelve thouſand three hundred and twenty Priories, five hundred ſixty ſeven Nunneries, ſeven hundred Convents of Fryars, two hundred fifty nine Commanderies of* Malta; *beſides all the Colledges of the Jeſuites.* And the Pariſh Prieſts are *an hundred thirty thouſand* of all ſorts. And whereas the Kingdom is ſuppoſed to have about fifteen millions of people; the Clergy and their Miniſters are judged to be *three millions* of them.

Judge now like men of reaſon and impartiality, whether the tongues of theſe men be fit to call us Mercenaries, or Hirelings, or ſuch as preach for filthy lucre. Or whether ever greater impudence was manifeſted by the vileſt Son of *Adam,* than for ſuch men that Lord it over Emperours, Kings and Princes, and devour the wealth of the Chriſtian world, to call poor Miniſters of Chriſt, Covetous, or Hirelings, that are content with food and rayment, and a mean education of their children. Judge of this dealing; and if you had rather have the Popiſh Prieſthood, with the numberleſs ſwarm of Fryars and ſeveral orders, you may take them, and ſay, you had your choice.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXIII.

Detect. 24. ANother of their designs, Conjunct with the last mentioned is, to *perswade the world that they only have a true Ministry or Priesthood, and an Apostolical Episcopacy and true Ordination: and that we and all other Churches have no true Ministers, but meer Lay men under the name of Ministers, because we have no just Ordination.* And how prove they all this? Why, they say, that they have a Pope, that is a true Successor of Saint *Peter:* but we have no Succession from the Apostles, and therefore no just Ordination, because no man can give that Power which he hath not. And we are Schismaticks separated from the Church, and therefore our Ordinations are invalid. And some of our Churches have no Bishops, and therefore say they, we have no true Ministry there, nor are they true Churches. These are their Reasons.

In answer to which I shall first refer the Reader to my *Second sheet for the Ministry in Justification of their Call*; where these Reasons are confuted, and our calling vindicated: and I shall forbear here to repeat the same things again. Also I refer you for a fuller Answer to the *London* Ministers *Jus Divinum Ministerii*; and to Mr. *Tho. Balls* Book for the Ministry; and Mr. *Masons* Book in vindication of the Ministry of those Reformed Churches that have not Prelates; and to *Voetius Desper. Caus.*

2. Though we need not fetch our Ordination from *Rome*, yet, as to them, we may truly say, that if they have any true Ordination and Ministry, then so have we: For our first Reformers were Ordained by their Bishops, which is enough to stop their mouths.

If

If they say that our Schism hath cut off our power of Ordination, I answer *ad hominem*, that (though it is they that are indeed the Notorious Schismaticks, yet) if we were what they falsly say we are, it would not null our Ordination, Confirmation, or such other acts. And this is the Judgement of their own writers. I shall at this time only cite the words of one of them, and of many in that one; and that is *Thom. à Jesu de Conversione Gentium, lib. 6. cap. 9.* Where he affirms it to be one of the Certainties agreed on, [*that Schismaticks lose not, nor can lose any spiritual power consisting in the spiritual Character of Baptism, or Confirmation, or Orders. For this is indelible, as* D. Thomas *teacheth here,* Art. 3. *and* Turrecremata *confirmeth,* lib. 4 sum. part. 1. c. 7: *and* Silvester verb. Schismatici: *and it appeareth by Pope* Urbans Can. Ordinationes, 9. q. 1, *who judgeth those to be truly ordained, that were ordained by Schismatical Bishops: and from* Austin lib. 6. de Bapt. Cont. Donatist. cap. 5, *where he saith, that* [*A Separatist may deliver the Sacrament as well as have it.*] *He next addeth, that yet such are deprived of the faculty of Lawful using the Power which they have, so that it will be their sin to use it, though it be not a nullity if they do use it: and that thus those are to be understood that speak against the Ordination, Confirmation,* &c. *of Schismaticks*; viz. *that It is unlawful, because their power is suspended by the Church, but not a Nullity, because they have the Power,* pag. 316. *He puts the Question* [*Whether Schismatical Presbyters and Bishops do want the Power of Order, or only want Jurisdiction?*] *And he answereth out of* D. Thom. 22. q. 39. art. 3, *that* [*They want Jurisdiction, and cannot Absolve, Excommunicate, or grant Indulgences, and so they cannot elect and give Benefices, and make Laws — But yet they have the holy Power of Orders; and therefore a schismatical*

matical Bishop doth truly make and consecrate the Eucharist, truly Confirm, truly Ordain; and when he Electeth and promoteth any to Ecclesiastical Orders, they truly receive the Character of Order, but not the Use, because they are suspended, if knowingly they are ordained by a Schismatical Bishop.] He next asketh, [*Whether this punishment depriving them of Jurisdiction, take place with all Schismaticks?*] And answers, that *some say*, [*that before the Council of* Constance *this punishment belonged to all notorious Schismaticks, but not to the unknown ones: but since that Council, it takes place only on those, that are expresly and by name denounced, or manifest strikers of the Clergy:*] others say otherwise. But he himself answers, that [*If a schismatick be tolerated, and by the common error of the people be taken for lawful, there's no doubt but all his acts of Jurisdiction are valid; which we shall affirm also of Hereticks: But if a Presbyter or Bishop be a manifest Schismatick, then some say, that those acts that require Jurisdiction are invalid; but others say, that they are all valid in case the Schismatick be not not by name excommunicated, or a manifest striker of the Clergy.*] Thus far *Thom. à Jesu* opening the judgement of the Papists Doctors themselves in the point.

And observe, that it is but their own Canons, that is, their own wills, that the Papists here plead when the Council of *Constance* hath so altered the business.

As for the Vindication of the *English* Ordination and succession, it is so fully done already by Mr. *Mason*, and many others, that I pass it by as needless: And as to the *forraign* Churches, *Voetius* hath done it unanswerably against *Jansenius*; and this which I after write is to that end.

2. Though this that is said is enough as to the Papists, yet I add for fuller satisfaction, that *their succession is interrupted, and therefore they are most unfit to be our*

Judges

Judges in this. They have had so long schisms, in which no man knew who was the right Pope, nor knoweth to this day; and so long removes and vacancies, and such interpositions of various wayes of chooſing their Pope, and interruptions by Heretical Popes, condemned by General Councils; besides Murderers, Adulterers, Simonists, and such as their own Writers (as *Genebrard*) expresly say, *Were not Apostolical, but Apostatical*; yea Popes that by General Councils have been judged or charged with infidelity it self (as I have formerly proved,) that there's nothing more certain than that their succession hath been interrupted.

3. They cannot be certain but it's every age interrupted, and that there's no true Pope or Bishops among them, because the intention of the Ordainer or Consecrator is with them of necessity to the thing: and no man can be certain of the Intention of the Ordainers. And therefore *Bellarmine* is fain to take up with this, that though we cannot be sure that he is a true Pope, Bishop or Presbyter that is ordained, yet we are bound to obey him. But where then is the Certainty of succession?

4. What succession of Episcopal Consecration was there in the Church of *Alexandria*, when *Hierom* (*Epist. ad Euagrium,*) tells us, that [*At* Alexandria, *from* Mark *the Evangelist even till* Heraclius *and* Dionysius *their Bishops, the Presbyters did always name one man that Bishop, whom they chose from among themselves, and placed in a higher degree: Even as if an Army make an Emperour, or the Deacons choose one of themselves, whom they know to be industrious, and call him the chief Deacon.*] Thus *Hierom* shews that Bishops were then made by meer Presbyters. And in the same Epistle he proves from Scripture, that Presbyters and Bishops

Bishops were then all one. And your *Medina* accusing *Hierom* of errour in this, saith, that *Ambrose*, *Austin*, *Sedulius*, *Primasius*, *Chrysostom*, *Theodoret*, *Oecumenius*, *Theophylact*, were in the same heresie, as *Bellarmine* himself reporteth him. So that Presbyters now may makes themselves Bishops as those of *Alexandria* did. And as *Hierom* there saith, [*All are the successors of the Apostles*;] and our Bishops or Presbyters are such, as much, at least, as yours: Yet Apostles as Apostles have no Successors at all, as *Bellarmine* well teacheth, *lib.* 4. *de Pontif. cap.* 25, saying, [*Bishops do not properly succeed the Apostles*; *because the Apostles were not ordinary, but extraordinary, and as it were delegate Pastors, who have no Successors. Bishops have no part of the true Apostolick Authority. Apostles could preach in the whole world, and found Churches, but so cannot Bishops. The Apostles could write Canonical Books, but so cannot Bishops. Apostles had the gifts of tongues and miracles, but so have not Bishops. The Apostles had Jurisdiction over the whole Church, but so have not Bishops. And there is no Succession, but to a Predecessor: but Apostles and Bishops were in the Church both at once, as appeareth by* Timothy, Titus, Evodius, *and many more. If therefore Bishops succeed Apostles, to what Apostle did* Titus *succeed? and whom did* Timothy *succeed? To conclude, Bishops succeed Apostles, but in the same manner as Presbyters succeed the seventy two Disciples* ——: *But it's manifest that Presbyters do not properly succeed the seventy two Disciples, but only by similitude. For those seventy two Disciples were not Presbyters, nor did they receive any Order or Jurisdiction from Christ.* Philip, Stephen *and others that were of the seventy two, had never been after Ordained Deacons, if they had been Presbyters before.*] Thus *Bellarmine*.

See

See now what's become of the Popish Apostolical Successors among their Bishops? And the scope of all this is to prove, that all Bishops receive their Power from the Pope; and so their succession is confined to him alone: and therefore as oft as there have been interruptions in the Papal Succession, so oft the Succession of all their Church was interrupted.

But if Bishops succeed not Apostles, and have not any of the Apostolick Power, who then doth the Bishop of *Rome* succeed? Why, *Bellarmine* hath a shift for this. But how sorry an one it is, you shall hear: *cap.* 25, he saith, that [*The Pope of* Rome *properly succeedeth* Peter, *not as an Apostle, but as an Ordinary Pastor of the whole Church.*] Let us then have no more talk of the Apostolick seat, or at least no more Arguing from that name. You see then that *Peter* was not the Universal Vicar as an Apostle, nor doth the Pope so succeed him. And do you think this doth not give away the Vicarship? Which way hereafter will they prove it?

But an Objection falls in *Bellarmines* way, that [*If this be so, then none of the Bishops of* Africk, Asia, *&c. were true Bishops, that were not made by the Pope. To which he answers* (*as well as he can,*) *that it's enough that the Pope do Consecrate them Mediately, by making Patriarchs and Arch-bishops to do it; and so* Peter *did Constitute the Patriarchs of* Alexandria *and* Antioch: *who thus receiving authority from the Pope, did Rule almost all* Asia *and* Africk.] But 1. That [*almost*] marreth the whole Cause: For where now is the universal Headship? 2. Did *Bellarmine* think in good sadness that *Alexandria* and *Antioch* were made at first the seats of Patriarchs, having as large Jurisdiction as afterward they attained? 3. How will he prove that *Peter* made these two Patriarchates, and that, not as an Apostle, but as an Ordinary Vicar General? 4. Who made the Patriarchate

of

of *Constantinople*, and gave them that vast Jurisdiction? Did *Peter* many hundred years after his death? Or did the Pope of *Rome*, that tooth and nail resisted and still sought to diminish his Power? Or rather did not the General Councils do it by the Emperours Commands, the Pope excepting and repining at it? 5. Who made the Patriarch of *Jerusalem?* And, who made *James* Bishop of *Jerusalem?* Did *Peter?* And, who made *Timothy* and *Titus* Bishops? Did *Peter* or *Paul?* And, who gave *Paul* that Power? Not *Peter* certainly. Reader, Do not these men jest with holy things? Or is it like that they believe themselves? 6. *Bellarmine* confesseth, that the *Potestas Ordinis, & interioris jurisdictionis*, are both as immediately from God to every Bishop as to the Pope, *cap.* 22. And why then should it be denyed of the power of *exterior* Jurisdiction? 1. Is one part of the Essence of the Office given by the Pope, and the rest without him? 2. And what if it be proved, that *exterior* and *interior* Jurisdiction of a Pastor is all one? Though the matter of obedience be exterior, yet the Jurisdiction is exercised only on the soul directly, in one case as well as another; it being the mind on which the obligation lyeth, and the Pastoral Rule is powerful and effectual, and further than you procure consent you are despised. For it's the *Magistrates* work to use violence. Bishops, as Bishops, can but perswade and deal by words with the inner man.

And thus you see what is become of the Papists Succession.

5. Most of the Ministers in *England*, till within these few years were ordained by Bishops. If that were of Necessity, they have it.

6. He that is ordained according to the Apostles directions, or prescript in Scripture, hath the true

Apoſtolical Ordination; but ſo are we Ordained: therefore, —— . The Apoſtles never Confined Ordination to thoſe Prelates that depend on the Pope of *Rome*. The Biſhops to whom the Apoſtles committed this Power, are the ſame that are called Presbyters by them, and they were the Overſeers or Paſtors each but of one ſingle Church, and not of many Churches, *de facto in* Scripture times, as Dr. *Hammond* hath at large aſſerted. And ſuch are thoſe that Ordain among us now. *Gregor. Nazianzen. Orat.* 18, ſaith thus [*I would there were no Preſidency, nor Prerogative of Place, and Tyrannical Priviledges; that ſo we might be known only by virtue, (or meer deſert:) But now this Right ſide, and Left ſide, and Middle, and Lower Degree, and Preſidency, and Concomitancy, have begot us many Contritions to no purpoſe, and have driven many into the Ditch, and have led them away to the region of the Goats.*]

What *Hierom* ſaith, both in his Epiſtle to *Evagrius*, and on *Tit. cap.* 2, is commonly known. The many plain Teſtimonies of *Anſelmn* are commonly Cited, as plain as *Hieroms. Alphonſ. à Caſtro adverſ. Hæreſ. lib.* 6. *in nom. Epiſcop.* had more ingenuity than to joyn with them that would wreſt *Hierom*'s words to a ſence ſo contrary to their moſt plain importance. *Tertullian cap.* 17. *de Bapt.* thought Lay-men, in Neceſſity, might Baptize, (and ſo doth the Church of *Rome* now.) And as he there ſaith, [*Quod ex æquo accipitur, ex æquo dari poteſt.*] And *ibid.* he ſaith, that it is *propter Eccleſiæ honorem*, that Biſhops Rule in ſuch matters, and that peace may be kept and Schiſm avoided. But that *probati quique ſeniores* did exerciſe Diſcipline in the Aſſembly, he teſtifieth in *Apologet.* who ſaith Dr. *Hammond* were their Biſhops.

Iſidore

Isidore Pelusiat. lib. 3. Epist. 223, ad Hieracem Episcopatum fugientem, saith [*And when I have shewed, what difference there is between the antient Ministry and the present Tyranny, why do you not Crown and Praise the Lovers of equality?*]

If you would see more of the Antients consenting with *Hicrom*, read *Sedulius* on *Tit.* 1. *Anselm. Cantuar. in Enarrat. in Phil.* 1. 1. *Beda* on *Act.* 20. *Alcuinus de Divinis officiis*, c. 35, 36. and on *John lib.* 5. *Col.* 547. &c. & *Epist.* 108. And of Ordination see *Anselm* on 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. And *Institut. in Concil. Colon. de sacr. Ordin. fol.* 196. See also what's said by our *Mart. Bucer script. Anglic. pag.* 254, 255, 259, 291. & *sequ.* & *Pet. Martyr. Loc. Com. Clas.* 4. *Loc.* 1. *sect.* 23. *pag.* 849. And *Wickliffes* Arguments *in Waldensis Passim.* And your own *Cassander Consult. Artic.* 14, saith [*It is agreed among all, that of old in the Apostles dayes, there was no difference between Bishops and Presbyters, but afterwards for Orders sake and the avoiding of Schism, the Bishop was set before the Presbyters.*] And *Ockam* determineth, that [*by Christs Institution all Priests of what degree soever are of equal Authority, Power and Jurisdiction.*] *Reynold Peacock*, Bishop of *Chicheſter* wrote a Book *de Ministrorum æqualitate*, which your party caused to be burnt. And *Richardus Armachanus, lib.* 9. *cap.* 5, *ad Quæst. Armen.* saith [*There is not found in the Evangelical or Apostolical Scriptures any difference between Bishops and simple Priests, called Presbyters; whence it follows, that there is one Power in all, and equal from their Order.*] & *cap.* 7, answering the Question, *Whether any Priest may Consecrate Churches*, &c. he saith [*Priests may do it as well as Bishops, seeing a Bishop hath no more in such matters than any simple Priest: though the Church for reverence to them appoint that*

those only do it, whom we call Bishops ——— It seems therefore that the restriction of the Priests Power was not in the Primitive Church, according to the Scripture.] All this is but *ad hominem.*

7. The chief error of the Papists in this cause is expressed in their reason, [*No man can give the Power that he hath not:*] wherein they intimate, that it is Man that giveth the Ministerial Power. Whereas it is the gift of Christ alone. Man doth but design the person that shall receive it, and then Christ giveth it, by his Law, to the person so designed: and then man doth invest him, and solemnize his introduction. As a woman may choose her an husband, but it is not she that giveth him the Power over her, but God who determineth of that Power by his Law, affixing it to the person chosen by her, and her action is but a condition *sine qua non*, or cause of the capacity of the matter to receive the form. And so is it here. Men do but obey God in a right choice and designation of the person: his Law doth presently give him the Power, which for orders sake he must be in a solemn manner invested with. But matters of Order may possibly vary; and though they are to be observed as far as may be, yet they alwayes give place to the Ends and substance of the work, for the ordering whereof they are appointed.

8. Temporal power is as truly and necessarily of God, as Ecclesiastical, and it was at first given immediately by him, and he chose the person: And yet there is no Necessity that Kings must prove an uninterrupted Succession. God useth means now in designing the persons that shall be Governors of the Nations of the earth. But not alway the same means. Nor hath he tyed himself to a successive Anointing or Election: else few Kings on earth would hold their Scepters. And no man (from any diversity in the cases) is able to prove, that

that a man may not as truly be a lawful Church-governor, as a lawful Governor of the Common-wealth, without an uninterrupted succession of Ministerial Collation.

9. If *Bellarmine* be forced to maintain, that with them it is enough that a Pastor have the place, and seem lawful to the people, and that they are bound to obey him, though it should prove otherwise; then we may as well stand on the same terms as they.

10. In a word, Our Ordination being according to the Law of Christ, and the Popes so contrary to it: we are ready at any time, more fully to compare them, and demonstrate to any impartial man, that Christ doth much more disown their Ordination than ours; and that we enter in Gods appointed way. Mr. *Eliot* in *New England* may better Ordain a Pastor over the *Indians* converted by him, than leave them without, or send to *Rome*, for a Bishop, or for Orders. But again I must refer you, of this subject, to the Books before mentioned, and the Sheet which I have written, lest I be over tedious: Especially to *Voetius de desperata Causa Papatus* against *Jansenius*: And to Mr. *Mason* and others, that have Vindicated the English Ordination.

CHAP. XXXIV.

Detect. 25. ANother of their Deceits is, *In pretending the Holineſs of their Churches, and Miniſtry, and the unholineſs of ours.* This being matter of fact, a willing and impartial mind may the eaſier be ſatisfied in it. They prove their Holineſs, 1. By the Canonized Saints among them. 2. By the devotion of their Religious Orders, and their ſtrictneſs of living. 3. By their unmarried Clergy. 4. By their ſanctifying Sacraments and Ceremonies: In all which they ſay that we are wanting, and ſo far wanting, that being out of the Church, there is no true Holineſs among us.

When in the Preface of my Book againſt Popery, called *The Safe Religion*, I had truly ſpoken my experience, that I had never the happineſs to be acquainted with any Papiſt of a ſerious ſpiritual temper, and holy life, but only ſome of a Ceremonious formal kind of Religion, and but with very few that lived not in ſome groſs ſin, I was paſſionately cenſured by ſome of the Papiſts, as one that condemned all for ſome. When as 1. I only ſpoke of my own acquaintance, which I confeſs was very narrow, and no fit meaſure by which I may judge of the unknown. 2. And I added withal, that yet I was confident that God had his ſervants among them, though I had not the happineſs to know them. 3. And is it not a ridiculous buſineſs, that theſe ſame men ſhould be ſo paſſionate with me, for ſpeaking but the truth, concerning the ungodlineſs of ſome of them, when at the ſame time they make it an Article of their faith, and an eſſential point of Popery, *That no one Proteſtant hath charity, or can be ſaved,*

saved; yea, *that no Christian in the world is sanctified really, and can be saved, but a Papist.* O the partiality of these men! 4. Yea when they necessitate us to mention their ungodliness by calling us to it, and laying the stress of all our cause upon the point: yea laying the very Christian faith it self upon the Holiness of their Church. For we must not know that Scripture is Gods word, or that Christianity is the true Religion, till we first know that the Church of *Rome* is the true Church, that we may receive it on their credit: And we must know that they are the true Church by being the only Holy people in the world. I must profess that if my faith lay on this foundation, I know so much of the falshood of it, that I must needs turn Infidel: and I can no more believe this, than I can believe that the snow is not white.

They confess (I thank them for nothing) that their common people are bad; but yet say they, [*There is some good ones among us*, Inter hæreticos autem nullus est bonus: *But among the hereticks not one is good*:] So saith *Thom. à Jesu de convers. omn. Gent. pag.* 531. And saith *H. Turbervile* Manual p. 84, [*But I never yet heard of any Protestant Saints in the world.*] O wonderful perverseness of the hearts of Sectaries! O wonderful Patience of God! Did not this mans heart tremble or smite him to write so horrid, so impudent a reproach against so many precious Saints of God? Durst he thus attempt to rob the Lord of the fruit of his blood? and to vilifie his Jewels? and as *Rabshakah*, to reproach the *Israel* of God? to attempt to pluck them out of Christs hand that are given him by his Father; and to shut them out of heaven, that are redeemed and made heirs by so dear a Price; and to spit in their faces whom Christ hath washed with his blood? Did he not fear that dreadful threatning of Christ, *Mat.* 18. 6,

[*But who so shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, it were better for him that a milstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.*] Though I see so much impiety among the Papists, I dare not say, I dare not think, that God hath not some Holy ones among them. It's dangerous condemning those that Christ will Justifie, and making his members to be the members of the Devil, and abusing so grosly the apple of his eye. If I see a man live wickedly, I dare say that he is of a wicked life; but I dare not say that *All are so*, unless it be among men, whose principles I am sure are inconsistent with godliness, and I know that they hold those principles practically or prevalently. And therefore I must say again, that I have been acquainted with some Papists, learned and unlearned. The unlearned few of them knew what Christianity was, nor whether Christ were God or Man, Male or Female, nor whether ever he was the King, Prophet or Priest of the Church, nor for what end he dyed, nor what faith or repentance is; but were infidels under the name of Papists or Catholicks. The learned and unlearned live in some gross sin or other, either all or near all that I have been acquainted with. The better sort would ordinarily swear, [*by their Lady, and by the Mass*,] and sometime greater oaths. The rest were, some fornicators or adulterers, some drunkards or revellers and gamesters, or such like: And never had I the happiness to be acquainted with one that would speak experimentally and savourily of the work of Grace upon his soul, of the life of faith, of communion with God, and of the life to come; but their Religion lay in being the Popes subjects, and in fasting on Fridayes and in Lent from some sorts of meat, and in saying over so many *Ave Maries*, *Pater Nosters*, or the like; and

in

in observing dayes, and hours, and Ceremonies. Yet I again say, I fully believe that there be better among them, though I am not acquainted with them, and that my acquaintance is but narrow.

But if these men that [*never heard of a Protestant Saint*,] and that conclude [*there is no one saved but a Papist*,] and build their salvation on this as an Article of their faith, had known but those that I have known, and yet know; they would either have been of another mind, or have been left unexcusable in a malicious reproaching of the Saints of the most high. I bless the Lord that I can truly say, that I know many and many, that (as far as the heart of another can be known, by words and a holy life) do live in much communion with God: whose souls are daily longing after him, and some of them, that have vacancy from worldly necessities, spending much of their lives upon their knees, having had many a special extraordinary return to their importunate requests: whose delight is in the Law of the Lord, in which they meditate day and night, (which is lockt up among the Papists:) whose hearts smite them for vain words or thoughts, or the loss of a few minutes of time: that live in exemplary humility, meekness and self-denyal, bearing wrongs patiently, and doing good to as many as they can, as the servants of all, contemning the Riches and Honours of the world, mortifying the flesh, and some of them longing to be dissolved and to be with Christ: in whom the world never knew either once drunkenness, fornication, or one rash oath, or any other gross sin, that I could ever hear of. And is it certain that all these shall be damned, because they believe not in the Pope? Nay is it not certain by Promise that all such shall be saved?

I must

I must again profess, that when the Papists lay their faith and cause on this, that their Church *is Holy, and ours and all other are every man unholy*, it's almost all one to me as if they said that *no men but Papists have souls in their bodies*, and laid their faith on this; and as soon I think should I believe them, if this were their belief. It's a good preservative against Popery, when a man cannot turn Papist without putting out his eyes, and renouncing his wit, and reason, and common experience, as well as his charity; yea without denying of what he knoweth by his own soul!

But let us come to their Evidences. 1. They say, *We have no Canonized Saints.* I answer 1. All the Apostles and Saints of the first ages were of our Religion; and many of them have been beholden to the Pope for Canonizing them.

2. We have no Usurper among us that pretendeth Infallibly to know the hearts of others, nor to number Gods Saints. But with us, the Holy Ghost *maketh Saints*, and their lives *declare it*; and those that converse with them *discern it*, so far as to be highly confident; and men discern it in themselves, so far as to be Infallibly (though not Perfectly) certain.

3. It seems the Pope takes Saints to be rare with them, that they must be named and written with red Letters in an Almanack. And *H. T. Man. pag.* 84, is fain to send us for proof to their Chronicles and Martyrologies, and he nameth four Saints that they have had, *viz.* Saint *Austin the Monk*, Saint *Bennet*, Saint *Dominick*, and Saint *Francis*. Now we all know that none but Saints are saved, *and that without holiness none can see God, Heb.* 12. 14. So that it seems if sanctity be so rare among the Papists, salvation must be rare.

But

But as for us, we make it our care to admit none but Saints to our Church Communion, though we preach to others to prepare them for it: For we believe that the Church is a Holy Society, and find *Paul* calling the whole Churches that he writes to by the title of [*Saints*], and we believe it is [*the Communion of Saints*] that is there to be held. And if we had no more Saints in one County at once, yea in some one Parish at once, than would fill up the Popes Calender, so as to have one for every day in the year, we should betake our selves to bitter lamentation. Whereas the Church of *Rome* takes in all sorts of the unclean, and is so impure and polluted a society, that it's a wonder how they should have the face to boast of their holiness, to men that live among them and know them. Thousands of their members are stark Infidels, as not knowing the Essentials of the Christian Faith. It's known here in *Ireland*, that abundance of them know not who Christ was, but that *he was a better man than Saint Patrick*. Bishop *Usher* saw it and lamented it, that they perished as Heathens for want of knowing Christianity it self, while they went under the name of Catholicks: and therefore he would have perswaded the Popish Priests to have consented that they should be all taught a Catechism of the common principles that we are agreed in; but he could not procure it. When Dr. *Jo. White* asked one of them in *Lancashire*, *who Jesus Christ was?* she answered, that [*sure it was some good thing, or else it should not have been put into the Creed.*]

And how much swearing, whoredom, drunkenness, and other wickedness is in their Church, is known not only by the complaints of their own writers, but by the too common experience of Travailers. We have known Papists that have turned from them by the experience

experience of one journey to *Rome*, and seeing what is there. And for Church censures by which any of these should be purged out, they are laid by, and reserved for other uses; even as thunder-bolts for the Popes Adversaries, and the servants of Christ whom they take for Hereticks, and for Princes whom the Pope would have deposed and murdered. These things are not meer words, but the lives of many Kings and Princes have been the sacrifice of the *Roman* Holiness.

And what need you any further proof, that their Church is as the common wilderness and not as the Garden of Christ, and is a Cage of all unclean birds, than that they actually keep them all in their Communion. It made my heart rise at their hypocrisie and filthiness, to read one sentence in one of the most learned, and sober, and honest of all their Bishops that have written, and that is *Albaspinæus Observat. 1. pag. 1.* Saith he [*Siquis unquam hoc seculo, (quod nescio an acciderit,) Communione fuit privatus, solâ fuit Eucharistiæ perceptione: in reliquis suæ vitæ partibus, quam ante Excommunicationem habuit, eandem cum ceteris fidelibus consuetudinem, & usum retinuit.*] That is, [*If ever any one man in this age was put from the Communion (which I know not whether such a thing hath come to pass,) it was only from the receiving the Eucharist; in the other parts of his Life, he retained the same familiarity and converse with other Believers, which he had before his Excommunication.*] Here you see from a credible Bishop, that lived in the thickest of their Clergy in *France*, that he knew not that any one person in the age that he lived in, was ever kept from the Lords Supper: but if he were, yet that was all; he was still a member of their Church, and familiar with the rest. Let the Chri-

Christian world then observe by their practice, what an abominable hypocritical contest they make, for to prove the Power of Church-government to be only in their Pope, and the Prelates to whom he giveth it; and when they have done, do make so little use of the Power which they so pretend to, as not to exercise the Censures of the Church upon one offender there in an age. How were that man worthy to be thought of, or to be used, that would set all the world on fire by contending, that no Schoolmaster or Physitian should be suffered in the whole world, but himself and such as he giveth power to: and when he hath done, will not by himself or his subjects and dependants teach or heal one person in an age? Were such an one meet to live on the earth? Or should we judge that man in his wits that would believe him? O what a stye is the *Roman* Society! What dunghils are in their Assemblies! And yet must not the Shovel or the Beesom be used once in an Age? What! no weed pulled up? no superfluous branch cut off? Is this the use of all the Canons of their Church concerning Excommunication, and Abstention? Must the Christian world be at such a vast expence, to maintain so rich and numerous a Clergy for this? And must we cast out our Pastors to receive such as these? When we should be ashamed, if we had not exercised more of the cleansing power of the Keyes in one Parish Church, than *Albaspinæus* knew of among the Papists in a whole age.

But perhaps there is little of this filth among them to be cast out. He that readeth their own Writers, or liveth among them, and seeth their lives, will hardly think so. He that had but seen the Murders of their Popes for the obtaining of the Popedom, or how Pope *Stephen* raged against the Carcass of Pope *Formosus*, drawing it out of the grave, and changing its Pontifical

fical habit to a Secular, and cutting off his fingers; or he that had ſeen Pope *Chriſtopher* caſting the Corps of Pope *Leo* the fift into the River *Tiber*, or Pope *Sergius* keeping the ſaid *Chriſtopher* bound in priſon, or Pope *Boniface* the ſeventh putting out his Cardinals eyes, would ſcarce believe that the Holy Seat of *Peter* were indeed Holy: (all which *Platina* and others of their own Writers give us notice of.) He that readeth *Baronius* himſelf telling us (*To.* 10. *an.* 897. *n.* 6,) [*how Pope* Stephen *the ſeventh defiled St.* Peters *ſeat with unheard of ſacrileage, not to be named*; *and* (*ſect.* 4. *ib.*) *how the Princes of* Tuſcia *were brought into* Peters *Chair and Chriſt's Throne, being monſtrous men, of moſt filthy lives and deſperate manners, and every way moſt filthy.*] He that ſhall read the ſame flattering Cardinal, ſaying, (*An.* 900. *ſect.* 1,) [*that ugly monſters were thruſt into the Papacy*; *that it was dawbed with dung, infected with ſtinks, defiled with filthineſs, and collowed by theſe with a perpetual infamy.*] And (*an.* 912. *ſect.* 8,) [*that at* Rome, *the moſt powerful and the moſt ſordid whores did Rule*; *at whoſe will the ſeats were changed, Biſhops were made, and, which is horrid to be heard, and not to be ſpoken, their ſweet-hearts, falſe Popes were thruſt into* Peters *ſeat.*] And [*that for an hundred and fifty years the Popes were wholly faln from the virtue of their Predeceſſors, being diſorderly, and Apoſtatical, rather than Apoſtolical, not entring by the door, but by the back-door,*] ſaith a paſſionate Papiſt, *Genebrard*, *Chron. l.* 4. *an.* 901. I ſay, he that ſhall read theſe impartially, will ſcarce think the Head of their Church hath been Holy, which is an Eſſential part of it; (nor that their ſucceſſion is uninterrupted.)

But

But if besides these you would read but *Nic. Clemangis*, *Alvarus Pelagius de planctu Ecclesiæ* (*lib. 2. art. 2. fol.* 104,) and many such like; or their Poets *Mantuan*, *Dantes*, &c. or *Petrarch*, *Mirandula*, &c. you would think the Holiness of *Rome* should be the poorest proof in the world of their being the only Church.

Their *Espencæus* and others recite that Distich,

Vivere qui cupitis sanctè, discedite Roma:
Omnia cum liceant, non licet esse bonum.

Platina saith (*in vita Marcellini,*) [*Our vices are so increased, that they have scarce left us any place for mercy with God. How great is the Covetousness of the Priests! especially of those that rule all! how great lust! how great ambition and pomp! how great ignorance of themselves, and of the Christian Doctrine! how little Religion, and that rather counterfeit, than true! how corrupt manners! even such as in the prophanest secular men were to be detested! it's not worth the speaking: when they sin so openly and so publickly, as if they sought Praise by it.*]

Their *Claudius Espencæus* on *Tit. pag.* 75, saith [*Where is there under the Sun a greater liberty, clamor, impunity of all evil, that I say not infamy and impudency* (*than at* Rome:) *Verily it is such as no man can believe but he that hath seen it, and no man can deny it that hath seen it.*] This was written since the Council of *Trent*.

And in the Council of *Trent*, their *Cornelius Musse*, a Bishop there, and the wonder of his age among the Papists, saith, that [*there was no monsters of filthiness, or sink or plague of uncleanness, with which both*

both people and Priest was not defiled. In the very Sanctuary of God, there was no shame, no modesty, no hope or regard of good living: but unbridled and untamed lust, singular audaciousness, incredible wickedness.] And after more of the like he adds, [*Would they had not fain from Religion to superstition, from Faith to infidelity, from Christ to Antichrist, yea as men that had no souls, from God to* Epicurus *or* Pythagoras, *saying in an impious heart, and an impudent mouth, There is no God. And yet now of a long time, there hath been no Pastor that would require, (or seek them again;) I say, there was none to seek them, because they all sought their own things, but not one the things of Jesus Christ.*] The same Bishop *Cornelius Muss* after the Council writes thus (*To. 2. Serm. 2. Dom. V. Quadr.*) [*The Roman Name is hateful with all Nations; and see, I pray you, how little esteem the Church it self is of, because of the scandals that are heard, seen and felt. I speak not now of enemies, that call it* Babylon, *Hell, the Whore, and say it is the sink of all Errours: But I speak of friends, that groan and daily sigh within themselves, saying, O holy City, how art thou thus profaned! O glorious City! that are thus become vile, thus condemned and neglected.*] These and many more such Testimonies of their own writers, *Rivet*, and many of ours, have oft set before them.

Guicciardine their Historian saith, that [*Those are called Good Popes, whose Goodness is not worse than other mens wickedness.*]

And if you think that now the matter is much mended, read but *Claud. Espencæus in Tit. 1. pag. 75*, complaining that the promises made by the Pope, of Reformation, at the Council of *Trent*, were all broken, and nothing done but deceit and shews. And of Pope *Sixtus* the fifth, *Bellarmine* gave out his judgement, that he

he thought, when he dyed he went to the Devil, saying, [*Qui ſine pœnitentia vivit, & ſine pœnitentia moritur, proculdubio ad infernum deſcendit:*] [*He that lives without Repentance, and dyeth without Repentance, undoubtedly goes to Hell.*] And ſaith *Watſon* of him (in *Quodlib. pag.* 56, 57,) Bellarmine *ſaid to an Engliſh Doctor* [*Conceptis verbis, quantum capio, quantum ſapio, quantum intelligo, Dominus noſter Papa deſcendit ad infernum:*] [*As far as I can reach, as far as I have any wiſdom, as far as I underſtand, in plain terms, Our Lord the Pope is gone to Hell.*] But which way he went thither, all the world knows not; but *Barthol. Moriſot.* in the Life of *Henry* the Great of *France*, *cap.* 17, ſaith [*that when the Spaniards perceived his contrivances to forſake their party, leſt he ſhould joyn with the enemy, they cauſed him to be ſtrangled in the night by a Franciſcan, or one in a Monks habit, and the next day gave out that a Domeſtick Devil had ſtrangled him; and to make good the report, a Book was written of his life, and printed, where all the wickedneſs of Pope* Alexander *the ſixth is charged on him.*] And how the Popes are ſtill choſen by impious Juglings and combinations, *Rivet* tells you out of your own champion, *Cardinal Perron*, his *Legationes & Negotiat.* And of the ſaying of Cardinal *Oſſatus ad D. Villeroy Epiſt.* 87, concerning *Pope Clement* the eighth, eſteemed one of the very beſt of them: who perſwaded the King of *France* to join with the *Spaniard* in the Invaſion of *England*, and when the Cardinal anſwered that [*the King of* France *was under an Oath of Peace with the Queen of* England,] the Pope (their beſt Pope) replyed, that [*the Oath was made to an Heretick, but he was bound by another Oath to God and the Pope;*] and added that [*Kings and other Sovereign Princes tolerate themſelves in all things that make*

for their commodity, and it's now come to pass that it is not imputed to them, nor taken to be their fault;] and he alledged the saying of *Francisc. Mariæ Duke of Urbin*, that [*a Noble man, or Great man that is not the Soveraign, is blamed and counted infamous of all men, if he keep not his faith; but supream Princes may make Covenants, and break them again without any danger to their credit, and may lye, betray, and commit such like practises.*] These are your best Popes! Poor men! that can forgive other mens sins, and pardon them the pains of Purgatory, and cannot save their own souls from Hell! Are they not like to Govern the Universal Church well, that can no better Govern themselves, or that one City where they dwell? And are not these men worthy to be consulted as infallible Oracles, by those that dwell at the Antipodes, though it cost them their lives to sail or travail to them? Can he be a Christian or be saved that believeth not in one of these men? Or can any man receive the Christian faith or Scriptures, till he first know these good men to be Christs infallible Vicars?

And how many thousand Whores are licensed at *Rome*, how sumptuously they live, what revenues come to the Pope by them, many of your own mention. And though some of you write for it, and your Pope still maintaineth it, yet *Mariana* one of your Jesuites (though he was for King-killing) condemneth this, *lib. de Spectaculis, cap.* 16. And your *Claud. Espencæus lib.* 3. *de Continentia, cap.* 4, sets it out with a witness; lamenting *Rome*, as if it were turned all into one Whore-house, and bewailing it, that the Jews should so far shame you, that no one of their children may play the harlots, unless they first turn (Popish) Christians and be baptized, and then they have their liberty.

Of

Of the gain that comes to the Pope and Prelates by the Simoniacal Market of benefices, save me the labour of reciting, and read but *Nicol. Clemangis Archidiaconum Baiosensem Tract. de Annatibus non solvendis, & Alvarum Pelagium de Planctu Eccles. lib. 2. Art. 15. & l. 1. art. 67. & Cland. Espencæum in Tit. 1. pag. 68. & Cardinal. Cusanum de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 40. & Marc. Ant. de Dom. Spalatensem. de Repub. Eccles. lib. 9. c. 9. & Budæum li. 5. de Asse; & Duarenum J.C. de sacris Eccles. Minist. lib. 5. c. 8. & passim. Rivet* will direct you to many more.

Yea, that the odious sin of Sodomie was common, or too frequent with many of the Clergy and Popes themselves, (gluttony, drunkenness and whoredom being the common smaller sins,) see the same *Rivet* manifesting at large out of the express complaints of *Mapheus, Alvarus Pelagius*, and many more of their own writers. *Hoffmeister* cited by *Grotius Discussio Apol: Rivet. p. 72,* [*At cum Episcopi quidam ignorant, quid Sacramenti vox significet, cum ipsos pudeat sacramenta per seipsos conferre, cum omnia apud ipsos sint venalia, cum Ecclesiam defraudent suis sacramentalibus quæ vocant; quæ potest Sacramentis apud simpliciores esse reverentia? Jam quod ad Parochos & Ecclesiastas attinet, vix centesimus quisque de sacramentis ullam facit mentionem in suis ad plebem concionibus; hic ex ignorantia, ille ex negligentia* ———: *Gravissime peccatum est ab Episcopis nostris, dum numerantur potius ordinandi quam examinantur, & quantum quis nummorum tantum & favoris habet apud quosdam. Quæ hic premo prudens lector intelligit. Nolim enim hic referre quales Episcopos, Decanos, Canonicos, Pastores,* &c: *nobis subinde intrudat potius quam ordinet Romana Curia, Regum item & Principum aulæ: qui omnes, juxta jocum cujusdam, familiam suam satiant.*

(si modo tales bestiæ satiari possent,) munetibus sacris ———. Ab equorum stabulis, è culina, rapiuntur ad Sacerdotia, qui, quid Sacerdos sit, ne per somnium quidem cogitarunt, homines qui professione sunt indigni.]

Papirius Massonius that wrote the Deeds of the Popes for their honour, and fought his Reward from *Sixtus Quintus*, saith (*De Episcop. urb. lib. 6. in Gregor. 13.*) [*No man doth now a dayes look for Holiness in Popes: those are judged the best, that are a little good, or less naught than other Mortals use to be.*]

Pope *Pius* the second was one of the best that your Papal seat a long time had; and yet in his Epistle to his Father (*Epist. 15.*) that was angry with him for fornication, he saith [*Ais dolere te*——— i. e. *You say you are sorry for my crime, that I begot a son in sin (or bastardy). I know not what opinion you have of me. Certainly you that are flesh your self did not beget a son that is made of stone or iron. You know what a Cock you were your self. And for my part I am not gelded, nor one of them that are frigid (or impotent). Nor am I an hypocrite, that I should desire rather to seem good, than to be good. I ingenuously confess my errour; for I am not holyer than* David, *nor wiser than* Solomon. *It's an antient and usual sin. I know not who is without it:* (A holy Church you are that while!) *This plague is spread far and near, if it be a plague to make use of our naturals; though I see it not, seeing Nature, which doth nothing amiss, hath bred this Appetite in all living creatures, that mankind should be continued.*] This was he that was the glory of your Papacy, that knew none without this beastly sin.

And *Orichovius* tells Pope *Julius* the third, that Pope *Paul the second his predecessor* had a Daughter in the eyes of all men.

And

And of this Pope *Julius* the third, *Onuphrius* himself ſaith [*Being a Cardinal he followed voluptuouſneſs as by ſtealth, but being made Pope, and having what he would have, he caſt away all care, and gave up himſelf to his mirth and diſpoſition.*] Of whom *Thuanus* ſaith (*Hiſt. lib.* 6,) [*that he was very infamous as a Cardinal, but after paſt his life in greater infamy.*]

And *Alvarus Pelagius*, (*lib.* 2. *art.* 73. *fol.* 241, *&c.*) lamenting Whoredom as a common ſin, but ſpecially of the Clergy, tells us that the cauſe is, becauſe [*Commonly the Religious of that age were Gluttons or belly-Gods, Arrogant, Proud incomparably beyond ſecular men, Converſing with women, &c. And drink more wine in their Religious ſtate than before, and are commonly carnal. And that the Monks had their female Devotaries, with whom, by the Prelates licenſe, they converſed. And being ſent to preach, they go to play the whoremongers. And that there was ſcarce any one of the Holy Nuns without her carnal male Devotary, by which they broke their faith with Chriſt, &c.*] This was your Holy Church.

And *li.* 2. *art.* 28, he ſaith [*That moſt of the Clergy mix themſelves with gluttony, drunkenneſs and whoredom, which is their common vice, and moſt of them give themſelves to the unnatural vice (Sodomie)*——. *Thus continually, yea and publickly, do they offend againſt that holy chaſtity which they promiſed to the Lord: beſides thoſe evils not to be named which in ſecret they commit, which Papers will not receive, nor pen can write.*] Abundance more he hath of the ſame ſubject, and their putting their choiceſt youth into houſes of Sodomie. This book of *Alvarus Pelagius Bellarmine* calleth *Liber inſignis* (*de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.*)

Matth. Paris (in *Henr.* 3. *p.* 819,) tells us of Cardinal *Hugo*'s farewel ſpeech to the people of *Lions* when

he departed with the Popes Court [*Friends* (saith he) *since we came to this City we have brought you great commodity and alms. When we came hither we found three or four whore-houses; but now at our departure we leave but one, but that one reacheth from the East Gate to the West Gate.*] O Holy Pope! and Holy Church!

But *Costerus* the Jesuite easily answers all that I have said, *Enchirid. cap.* 2. *de Eccles.* that ☞ [*The Church loseth not the name* [*Holy,*] *as long as there is but One that's truly Holy.*] *Answ.* Is this your sanctity? I deny your conclusion. For 1. If the Head be unholy, an essential part is unholy; and therefore the Church cannot be Holy. 2. One person is not the Matter of the Church, as one drop of Wine cast into the sea doth not make it a sea of Wine; and one Italian in *England* makes not *England* Italian; nor one Learned man make *England* Learned.

And let the Papists observe, that it is from the very words of their own, that I have spoken of them what is here recited, and not from their adversaries. And therefore I shall be so far from believing the Gospel upon the Account that their Church is Holy that recommendeth it, or from believing them to be the only Church of Christ because of their Holiness, that I must bless God that I live in a sweeter air and cleaner Society, and should be loth to come out of the Garden into the Channel or sink to be made clean or sweet: but say, that the travailer learned more wit, that left us this Resolution,

Roma *vale*; *vidi*; *satis est vidisse*; *revertar*
Cum leno aut meretrix, scurra, cinædus ero.

2. The

2. THE second Proof which they bring of the Holineſs of their Church, is, the *ſtrict life of their Fryars*, as *Carthuſians*, *Franciſcans*, and others. *Anſw.* Having been ſo long already on this point, I will be but ſhort on this branch. In a word, 1. I have no mind to deny the Graces of the ſpirit in any that have them. Though travellers tell me lamentable ſtories of your Fryars, and *Guil. de Amore*, and his companions have ſaid much more, and many other Popiſh Writers paint them out in an odious garb; yet I do not doubt but God hath his ſervants among them. Read the hiſtory of *G. de S. Amore* before his Works.

2. But I muſt tell you that this alſo ſhews the Pollution of your Church in compariſon of our Churches, that Holineſs and Religion are ſuch rarities and next to Miracles among you, that it muſt be cloiſtred up, or confined to certain Orders that are properly called Religious, as if the people had no Religiouſneſs or Holineſs. When our care and Hope is to make all our Pariſh Churches far more Religious and Holy than your Monaſteries or Convents. Yea were not this Church much more Religious and Holy where I live, I think I ſhould have ſmall comfort in it. And if St. *Francis*, *Dominick*, &c. were ſuch as the Legends deſcribe them, our Fanatick Quakers are holy.

3. THeir third Proof of the Holineſs of their Churches, is, their *unmarried Clergy*. *Anſw.* 1. I will not ſtir too long in this puddle, or elſe I could tell you out of your own Writers of the odious fruits of your unmarried Clergy. Only (becauſe the eſſential parts of your Church are they that nearlieſt concern your cauſe,) I will ask you in brief, Whether it was not Pope *John* the eleventh that had *Theodora* for his whore? Whether it was not Pope *Sergius* the third, that begot Pope *John* the twelfth of *Maroſia*? Whether *John* the twelfth, *alias* the thirteenth (ſaith *Luitprandus*, and others of your own,) did not raviſh maids and wives at the Apoſtolick doors, and at laſt was killed in the Act of Adultery? Whether it were not Pope *Innocent* of whom a Papiſt wrote this diſtich,

Octo Nocens pueros genuit, totidemque puellas.
Hunc merito potuit dicere Roma patrem.

And whoſe Son was *Aloiſius*, made Prince of *Parma* by Pope *Paul* the third? And for your Arch-biſhops, Biſhops, Prieſts, &c. I ſhall now add but the words of your *Dominicus Soto de Inſtit. & Jure qu.* 6. *art.* 1. cited by *Rivet*, [*We do not deny* (ſaith he) *that in the Clergy, ſuch as keep Concubines, and are Adulterers, are frequent.*] I need not turn you to the Qu. of *Navarres* hiſtories.

2. We have many that live unmarryed, as well as you, but not on your terms: and take this for no great ſanctity.

3. We know that *Paul* directed *Timothy* and *Titus* to ordain him a Biſhop that was the Husband of one Wife,

Wife, and ruled well his houſe, having his children in ſubjection; and that the Church a long time held to this doctrine; and that *Greg. Nyſſen* was a marryed Biſhop. But if you are wiſer than the Spirit of God, or can change his Laws, or can prove the Holy Ghoſt ſo mutable as to give one Law by *Paul* and other Apoſtles, and another by the Pope, we will believe you and forſake the Scripture, when you can ſo far bewitch us and charm us to it.

We believe that a ſingle life is of very great Convenience to a Paſtor, when it can be held: and that Chriſts Rule muſt be obſerved [*Every man cannot receive this ſaying, but he that can, let him receive it.*] And whether Miniſters be Marryed or not Marryed (as many now living in the next Pariſhes to me are not, no more than my ſelf,) it is a ſtrange thing with us to hear of one in many Counties that was ever once guilty of fornication in his life: and if any one be but once guilty in the Miniſtry, he is caſt out though he ſhould be never ſo penitent, as any man that readeth the Act for ejecting ſcandalous Miniſters and Schoolmaſters may ſee. As alſo you may there ſee, that if he were but once drunk, if he ſwear, curſe, or be guilty of other ſcandalous ſins, he is caſt out without any more ado. And none are ſo earneſt for the through-execution of this Law as the Miniſters. If a Miniſter do but go into an Alehouſe, except to viſit the ſick, or on weighty buſineſs, it is a ſcandalous thing among us. We do not teach, as the Jeſuites cited by the *Janſeniſt Montaltus*, that a man may lawfully go into a Whorehouſe to exhort them from Whoredom, though he hath found by experience that when he comes among them, he is overcome and playes the Whoremonger with them.

Leſt the vices of your Clergy ſhould be laid open and puniſhed, you exempt them from the ſecular power, and

and will not have a Magistrate so much as question them for whoredom, drunkenness, or the like crimes. It is one of Pope *Nicolas* Decrees (*as* Caranza *pag.* 395, recites them) that [*No Lay man must judge a Priest, nor examine any thing of his life. And no secular Prince ought to judge the facts of any Bishops or Priests whatsoever.*] And indeed that is the way to be wicked quietly, and sin without noise and infamy. But for our parts, we do not only subject our selves and all our actions, to the tryal of Princes and the lowest Justice of Peace, as far as the Law gives him power; but we call out to Rulers daily to look more strictly to the Ministry, and suffer not one that is ungodly or scandalous in the Church. And if one such be known, our Godly people will all set against him, and will not rest till they cast him out (in times when there is opportunity for it,) and get a better in his stead. The whole Countrey knows the Truth of this.

If you say, as the Quakers do, that yet the most among us are ungodly, I answer, that Those among us that are known ungodly and scandalous, are not owned by us, nor are members of our Church, or admitted to the Lords Supper in those Congregations that exercise Church-discipline; but they are only as Catechumens, whom we preach to and instruct, if not cast out.

Your eighth General Council at *Constantinople*, *Can.* 14, decreed, that [*Ministers must not fall down to Princes, nor eat at their Tables, nor debase themselves to them; but Emperours must take them as Equals.*] But we are so far from establishing Pride and Arrogancy by a Law, that though we hate servile flattery and man-pleasing, yet we think it our duty to be the servants of all, and to condescend to men of low estate, and

and much more to honour our Superiours, and God in them.

The ſame Council decreed, *Canon.* 21, that [*None muſt compoſe any Accuſations againſt the Pope.*] No marvail then if all Popes go for Innocents. But we are lyable to the accuſations of any, before the publick judicatures; and would be ſo.

And becauſe you charge our Churches with Unholineſs, and that with ſuch an height of Impudency, as I am certain the Devil himſelf doth not believe you that provokes you to it; even that there is not One Good among us, nor One that hath Charity, nor can be ſaved (unleſs by turning Papiſt:) I ſhall therefore go a little higher and tell you, that I doubt not but the Churches in *England* where I live, are purer far than thoſe were in the dayes of *Auguſtine*, *Hierome*, &c. yea and that the Paſtors of our Churches are leſs ſcandalous than they were then. What if I ſhould compare many of them even to St. *Auguſtine*, St. *Hierom*, and ſuch others, both in Doctrine and Holineſs of Life? Should I do ſo, I know you would account it arrogancy. But yet I will preſume to make ſome compariſon, and leave you to Judge impartially if you can.

As for the Heavenlineſs of their writings, let but ſome of ours be compared with them, and you will ſee at leaſt that they ſpake by the ſame ſpirit. And for their Commentaries on Scripture, did we miſs it as oft as *Ambroſe*, *Hierom* and many more, we ſhould bring our ſelves very low in the eſteem of the Church. Even your *Cajetane* doth more boldly cenſure the Fathers Commentaries than this comes to.

And as to our lives, the Lord knows that I have no pleaſure in opening any of the faults of his Saints, nor ſhall I mention any, but what are confeſſed by themſelves

ſelves in Printed Books, and mentioned by others; and to boaſt of our own Purity I take to be a deteſtable thing, and contrary to that ſenſe of ſin that is in every Saint of God: But yet if the Lords Churches and ſervants are ſlandered and reproached, as they were by the Heathens of old, the vindicating them is a duty which we owe to Chriſt, and you are the cauſe of the inconveniences.

Thoſe Miniſters that I Converſe with, are partly Marryed and partly unmarryed. The Marryed live ſoberly, in Conjugal Chaſtity, as burning and ſhining lights before the people, in exemplary Holineſs of Life. The unmarryed alſo give up themſelves to the Lord and to his ſervice. And I verily think that, of many ſuch that converſe with me, there is not one that ever defiled themſelves by incontinency, and I am confident would be ready to take the moſt ſolemn Oath of it, if any Papiſt call them to it. And for the people of our Communion, through the mercy of God ſuch ſins are ſo rare, that if one in a Church be guilty once, we all lament it, and bring them to penitence, or diſown them, and they are the pity of all the Congregation.

And were the Churches better in the third, fourth, fift, ſixt, or following Ages? I doubt not. And I judge by theſe diſcoveries, 1. By the ſad Hiſtories of the Crimes of thoſe times.

2. By the lamentable complaints of the Godly Fathers, of the Biſhops and people of their times. What doleful complaints do *Baſil*, *Gregory Nazianz.* and *Greg. Nyſſen*, and *Chryſoſtom*, *Auſtin*, &c. make? (It were too long to recite their words.) What complaints made *Gildas* of the Britiſh Church? What a doleful deſcription have we of the Chriſtian Paſtors and People in his dayes from *Salvian*, through his whole Book *de Gubernat?*

3. I

3. I judge also by the Canons, and by the Fathers directions concerning Offenders. For example; *Gregory Mag.* saith of drunkards, [*Quod cum venia suo ingenio sunt relinquendi, ne deteriores fiant, si à tali consuetudine evellantur.*] And was this the Roman Sanctity even then? And was this St. *Gregories* Sanctity, that Drunkards must be let alone with pardon, lest if they be forced from their custome they be made worse? Then fair fall the Ministers of *England.* If such advice were but given by one of us, it would seem enough to cast us out of our Ministry. We dare not let one drunkard alone in our Church communion, where Church-discipline is set up.

So *Augustine* saith that [*Drunkenneß is a mortal sin,* si sit assidua, *if it be daily or usual.*] And that [*they must be dealt with gently and by fair words, and not roughly and sharply.*] If one of us should make so light of Drunkenness, what should we be thought? I cite these two from *Aquinas* 22. *q.* 150. *art.* 1. 4. *ad* 4. *&* *art.* 2. 1.

Many Canons determine that [*Priests that will not part with their Concubines, shall be suspended from officiating, till they let them go.*] Whereas with us, a man deserveth to be ejected, that should have a Concubine but one night in his life.

Gratian Distinct. 34, citeth *c.* 17, of a *Toletane* Council, saying, that *He that hath not a Wife, but a Concubine in her stead, shall not be put from the Communion.* His Corrector reciteth the whole Canon thus [*If any Believer have a Wife and a Concubine, let him not Communicate. But he that hath no Wife, and hath a Concubine in stead of a Wife, may not be put from the Communion. Only let him be content with one woman, either Wife or Concubine, which he will.*

will. He that liveth otherwiſe, let him be caſt off, till he give over, and return to penitence.]

In an Engliſh Council at *Berghamſted an.* 697, the ſeventh Canon is this, [*If a Prieſt leave his Adultery, and do not naughtily defer Baptiſm, nor is given to drunkenneſs, let him keep his Miniſtry, and the priviledge of his habit,*] Spelman, *pag.* 195. King *Alured* in the Preface to his Laws tells us, that *except Treaſon and Deſertion of their Lords, the Councils of the Clergy did lay but ſome pecuniary mulct on other ſins,* Spelm. *p.* 362.

All this ſhews that the Church then was much more corrupt than ours now in *England.*

Yea the beſt of the Fathers had ſuch blots, that I may well make their *Confeſſions* another diſcovery, that our Churches are as pure and holy as theirs. I will name but few of the chief, becauſe I would not rake into their faults needleſly, who are pardoned glorified Saints in Heaven. St. *Auguſtine* whileſt he leaned to the Manichees had a baſtard, and confeſſeth himſelf guilty of fornication. St. *Hierom* that was ſo vehement for Virginity and lived a Monaſtick life, doth yet confeſs that he was not a Virgin. St. *Bernard* that lived ſo Contemplative a life, in his *Serm. de beata virgine poſt ſerm.* 5. *de Aſſumpt.* confeſſeth, *ſe carere virginitate,* that he lacked his virginity. And though *Bellarmine* (*de ſcriptor. Eccleſ. pag.* 224,) do from that only reaſon queſtion whether it be *Bernards,* yet it is in the ſecond Tome among his undoubted writings, and this reaſon is a poor diſproof.

Now if one of our ordinary Miniſters ſhould be but guilty of ſuch a ſin, though but once, and that before Converſion ; no doubt but it would lye heavy on their Conſciences, and I am ſure it would leave ſuch a blot on

on their names, that were never likely to be worn off while they live.

When we tell the Papists of their Licensing Whore-houses at *Rome*, *Bononia*, *&c.* they commonly fly to the words of *Austin*, *lib. de ordine*, saying [*Aufer Meretrices de rebus humanis, & turbaveris omnia libidinibus*, i. e. *Take away Whores from among men, and you will disturb all things with lusts.*] Though this was written when *Austin* was but a young convert, and it seems that he after changed his mind; yet this shews that our times are far from the abominations of those, and our Pastors are far more strict than *Austin* then was.

4. As for the Holiness of their Church by Ceremonies, as Holy Water, Holy Oil, Relicks, Altars, and an hundred such things, I think it not worth the speaking of: All things are sanctified to us by the word and prayer. We devote our selves and all that we have to God, and then *to the Pure all things are Pure.* We neglect no Ordinance of God that we can know of and enjoy. *He is a spirit, and seeketh such as will worship him in spirit and truth.* This is the Holiness that we look after. But for numbring of Beads, and *Ave Maries*, and going pilgrimages, and such inventions of arrogant men, we place no Holiness in them; as knowing that God desireth not a Mimical or Histrionical worship, and that none knows what will please him so well as himself.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXV.

Detect. 26. ANother of their Deceits is, *by calling us to tell them when every one of their Errours did first begin, and what Pope did bring them in; or else they will not believe but they are from the Apostles.*

To this Bishop *Usher* and abundance of our Writers have answered them at large. I shall therefore speak but these few, but satisfactory words.

1. It belongs to you to prove the continuance of your Opinions or Practices, more than to us to prove the Beginning. 2. It sufficeth that we prove that there was a time when your errours were not in the Church, and that we can do from the Scriptures and the Fathers, and oft have done. 3. You know your selves of abundance of changes which you know not who did first introduce. Who first administred the Lords Supper in one kind only? Dare you say that this was from the beginning? Who first laid by the standing on the Lords day, and used kneeling? (forbidden *Can.* 20. *Concil. Nicen.* 1, and in other General Councils.) *Alvarus Pelagius de planct. Eccles. li.* 2. *art.* 2. *fol.* 104, saith [*The Church bewaileth the sins of the people, but specially of the Clergy, as greater than the sin of* Sodom. *For we see that Faith and Justice have forsaken the earth. The Holy Scripture and sacred Canons are accounted as fables . He's now a man of no knowledge that inventeth not Novelties.*] You see that then Novelties were brought in. The same *Vincentius Lirinensis* complaineth of, and not only complaineth of, but giveth Direction what to do, in case that [*Novella aliqua contagio, non jam portiunculam tantum, sed totam Pariter Ecclesiam commaculare conetur: If any novel contagion shall endeavour*

endeavour to ſtain not only a part of the Church, but the whole Church alike.] And then his advice is to appeal from Novelty to Antiquity, and not to the Pope or the preſent Church. And withal he addeth that [*This Direction is but for new hereſies at their firſt riſing; before they falſifie the rules of ancient faith,* (that is, before they corrupt antient Writers, or can pretend to Antiquity,) *and before by the large ſpreading of the venome, they endeavour to corrupt the volumes of our anceſtors.* But dilated and inveterate Hereſies are not to be ſet upon this way, becauſe by the long tract of time, they have had a long occaſion of ſtealing Truth. And therefore we muſt convince ſuch antient hereſies and ſchiſms by no means but by the only Authority of the Scripture if there be need, or avoid them——.] *Lirinenſ. cap.* 4. *&c.*

Were there not abundance of Novelties introduced, when *Auguſtine ad Januarium* ſaid, that [*They load our Religion with ſervile burdens, which God in mercy would have to be free, with a very few and moſt manifeſt Sacraments of Celebration; ſo that the condition of the Jews was more tolerable, that were ſubject to Legal Sacraments, and not to the preſumptions of men.*] Theſe words of *Auſtin* your own *Joh. Gerſon* reciting (*de vita ſpirit. animæ, lect.* 2. *par.* 3,) addeth of his own [*Si tuo tempore, &c. If in thy dayes thou didſt thus mourn, Oh wiſe* Auguſtine, *What wouldſt thou have ſaid in our time? where according to the variety, and motion of heads, there is incredible variety and diſſonant multiplicity of ſuch ſervile burdens, and as thou calleſt them, of humane preſumptions. Among which, as ſo many ſnares of ſouls, and entangling nets, there's ſcarce any man that walks ſecure, and is not taken* (*or catcht.*)]

How think you now in the Judgement of *Auguſtine* and *Gerſon*, whether there have any *Novelties* been brought into the Church? and whether all your Preſumptions and burdens, and (as *Gerſon* calls them) halters for ſouls, have come from the Apoſtles, or are your own? When all is thus overcome with Novelty, do you make any queſtion whether any thing be new?

It ſeems that *Bernard* thought that humane Traditions were too much befriended, when he thus deſcribeth the Aſſemblies that he approveth, *Epiſt.* 91, [*Such a Council (do I delight in) in which the Traditions of men are not obſtinately defended, or ſuperſtitiouſly obſerved: but they do diligently and humbly enquire, what is the good, and well pleaſing, and perfect will of God.*]

And it ſeems to me that General Councils by error introduced Novelties, when later Councils were fain to undo what the former had done: For ſo doth bleſſed *Auguſtine* profeſs they did, ſaying, *De Baptiſ. cont. Donat. lib.* 2. *cap.* 6, [*And Councils themſelves that are gathered through ſeveral Regions or Provinces, do without any ſcruple yield to the authority of more plenary Councils that are gathered out of the whole Chriſtian world; and thoſe ſame plenary Councils do often yield (or give place) the former to the later, when by ſome experiment of matters, that which was ſhut is opened, and that which lay hid is known.*] Sure here are alterations made even by General Councils that correct one another.

And what ſhould hinder the Introduction of Novelty when General Councils do ſo often err? Nay, if ſuch Councils be Morally and Interpretatively the whole Church, as the Papiſts ſay, then the whole Church doth err in the reception of ſome Novelty, before they declare

declare it by their decrees. If you say, that General Councils cannot err, nor introduce such Novelties, your Champion *Bellarmine* and many of your own, will give you the Lie. Saith he *De Concil. lib. 2. cap. 11*, [*Neque potest*, &c. *It cannot be answered that those Councils erred because they were not lawful*, (that is, *the Arian* and other Heretical General Councils, as that at *Sirmium*, *Millanie*, *Ariminum*, *Ephesus*, several at *Constantinople* disallowed by the Papists): *For to most of them there was nothing wanting but the Popes assent. Yea the second at* Ephesus *was altogether like that at* Basil: *For both were called by the Pope; in both of them the Popes Legate was present at the beginning; from both of them the Popes Legate shortly after went away; in both of them the Pope was excommunicated; and yet, that the Council of* Ephesus *erred, the adversaries will not deny.*] Hence he concludeth that [*the chief Power Ecclesiastical is not in the Church, nor in the Council, the Pope being removed* formaliter vel suppletive.]

And what should hinder, when there is but one mans vote against it, even the Pope's, but that Novelty and error may enter at any time, and when that one man is oft so wicked and Heretical as he is? For General Councils are but a meer name and mockery. The packing of them shews it. The Paucity and non-Universality of them shews it. The Management of their affairs shews it. They do nothing since the Papal reign, but what the Pope will (excepting the condemned Councils.) They have no Being till he Will, nor make any Decrees but what he Will; nor are their Decrees of any further power than he is pleased to give them. So that his Will is the sense of the General Council or Universal Church. I need not turn you for this, to *Sleidan* or *Vergerius* Bishop of *Trent*, that tell us the

Holy Ghost came to that Council in a Cloak-bag from *Rome*; nor to *Espencæus in Tit.* 1. *pag.* 42. seeing *Bellarmine* speaks it out, *De Concil. lib.* 2. *cap.* 11, saying, [*We must know that the Pope is wont to send Legates, instructed concerning the judgement of the Apostolick seat, with this Condition, that If the Council do consent to the Judgement of the Apostolick seat, it shall be formed into a Decree; If not, the forming of the decree shall be deferred till the Pope of* Rome, *being advised with, shall return his answer.*] And saith *Bellarmine de Concil. lib.* 2. *cap.* 11, [*In the Council of* Basil, Sess. 2, *it was decreed by common consent, together with the Popes Legate, that a Council is above the Pope; which certainly is now judged erroneous.*] And the Council of *Lateran* and *Florence* decreed the contrary. And *Pighius* saith, *Hierarch. Eccles. l.* 6, that [*The Councils of* Constance *and* Basil *went about, by a new trick and pernicious example, to destroy the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, and instead of it to bring in the Domination of a promiscuous confused popular multitude; that is, to raise again* Babylon *it self, subjecting to themselves, or to the community of the Church, (which they falsly pretended that they Represent,) the very Head and Prince of the whole Church, and him that is the Vicar of Christ himself in this his Kingdom; and this against Order and Nature, against the cleerest light of Gospel verity, against all Authority of Antiquity, and against the undoubted Faith and Judgement of the Orthodox Church it self.*]

Mark Papists: General Councils with the Popes *Nuncio* may bring in Novelties in faith, against the cleerest light of the Gospel, and the full Consent of Antiquity; and yet these Councils affirmed their opinions to be *de fide*, and the contrary to be Heretical and

and Damnable, and contrary to all Antiquity. You see then that Novelties are among you in matters of faith. And the French to this day are guilty of those *Novelties*, and also charge their Adversaries with Innovation.

Nay, what will you say, if General Councils themselves are but Novelties, though they are the foundation of the faith of one half of the Papists, (as the Pope is of the other?) *I say not so*, but judge whether your Champion *Pighius say so*, *Hierarch. Eccles. lib. 6. cap. 1. fol.* 230. Where he saith that [*Concilia universalia non habent Divinam*, &c. ☞ *General Councils have not a Divine or Supernatural Original, but meerly an humane Original, and are the Invention of* Constantine *a Prince, profitable indeed sometimes to find out in Controversie which is the Orthodox and Catholick truth: though to this they are not necessary, seeing it's a readyer way to advise with the Apostolick seat.*] How now Sirs? Is your Representative Church the foundation of your faith, a *Novelty* of *Constantines* invention; and yet are you in the old way, and must we be put to prove you to be *Novelists?*

Do you think those Popes did go the Old way, of whom *Alvarus Pelagius* speaks (*de planctu Eccles. art.* 15. *lib.* 2,) that [*They succeeded in authority, but not in Sanctity, intruding themselves, procuring, bargaining*, &c. *building Towers and Palaces in* Babylon, *that is, in* Rome *according to* Hierom.] Some foul innovation sure they were guilty of that so re-edified *Babylon.*

So that this is my first proof that you are Novelists; From the General Accusations of others, and Confessions of your own.

2. Another proof that changes may be, and yet the time and Authors be unknown; is, from the instance

of other Churches, that have been corrupted or subverted by Innovations, and yet the time and Authors are unknown. You accuse the Churches in *Habassia* of many errors your selves; and you are not able to tell us when they came in, or who introduced them. The same may be said of the Georgians, Armenians, Egyptians, yea and of the Greeks and Russians. Can you tell us when, and by whom, each error was introduced, that corrupted the Churches mentioned in the Scripture? as *Corinth*, *Philippi*, *Colos*, *Thessalonica*, *Ephesus*, *Laodicaa*, and the rest. You know you can give us no better an account of this, than we can of the Authors of your Corruptions, nor so good.

You know that among the Primitive Fathers, whose writings are come to our hands, many errors had the Major vote; as that of the *Corporeity of Angels*, (which your second General Council at *Nice* owned,) and their *Copulation with women before the flood*, the *Millenary conceit*, and many more which you confess to be errors. Tell us when any of these came in, if you can, (unless you will believe that *Papias* received the last from *John*, and then it's no error.) Who did first bring the Asian Churches to celebrate Easter at a season differing from yours? Who first brought the *Brittains* to it? Nay we know not certainly who first Converted many Nations on earth, nor when they first received their Christianity: and How then should we know when they first received each error?

And we find that good men did bring in Novelties: and what was by them introduced as indifferent, would easily by custom grow to seem Necessary: and what they received as a doubtful opinion, would easily grow to be esteemed a point of Faith. The Presbyters and whole Clergy of *Neocæsarea* were offended with *Basil* for

for his Innovations, *viz.* for bringing in a new Pſalmodie, or way of ſinging to God, and for his new order of Monaſticks: and they told him that none of this was ſo in *Gregories* dayes. And what anſwereth *Baſil?* He denyeth not the Novelty of his Pſalmodie, but retorts again on them, that their Letany alſo was new, and not known in the time of *Gregory (Thaumaturgus):* yea, ſaith he, [*How know you that theſe things were not in the dayes of* Gregory? *For you have kept nothing unchanged to this day of all that he was uſed to.*] You ſee what chopping and changing was then in the Church among all ſorts, when ſuch an alteration was made in leſs than forty years. Yet *Baſil* would not have unity to be laid on any of theſe things, but addeth, [*But we pardon all theſe things, though God will examine all things: Only let the principal things be ſafe,*] Baſil *Epiſt.* 63. Iſidore Peluſiota *lib.* 1. *Epiſt.* 90, ſaith, that [*The Apoſtles of the Lord ſtudying to reſtrain and ſuppreſs unmeet loquacity, and ſhewing themſelves Maſters of modeſty and gravity to us, did by wiſe Council permit women to ſing in the Churches. But as all Gods documents are turned into the contrary, ſo this is turned to diſſoluteneſs, and the occaſion of ſin. For they are not affected with deep compunction in ſinging Divine Hymns; but abuſing the ſweetneſs of the ſinging, to the irritating and provoking of luſt, they take it for no better than ſtage-play ſongs.*] Therefore he adviſeth that they be ſuffered to ſing no more.

Here you ſee 1. That changes had happened about many Divine things. 2. That he adviſeth himſelf the introducing of this novelty, that women be forbidden ſinging in the Church, becauſe of the abuſe, though he confeſs it a wiſe Apoſtolick Order. So that for Novelty by good men to creep into Gods worſhip, is not ſtrange.

3. Moreover the Nature of the thing may tell all the world, that neither you nor we can be accountable of the beginning of every error that creepeth into the Church: For 1. The distance of time is great. 2. Historians are not so exact: and what they tell us not, neither you, nor we can know. 3. Much History is perished. 4. Much is corrupted by your wicked forgeries, as hath been oft proved to you. 5. Mixtures of Fables have hindred the credit of much of it. 6. Nations are not individual persons, but consist of millions of individuals: And as it is not a whole Nation that is converted to the faith at once, so neither is it whole Nations that are perverted to Heresie at once, but one receiveth it first, and then more and more, till it over-spread the whole. *Paul* saith that such Doctrine eateth like a Gangrene; and that is by degrees, beginning on one part, and proceeding to the rest. 7. As I said before, that which is at first received but as an Opinion and an Indifferent thing, must have time to grow into a Custom, and that Custom maketh it a Law, and makes Opinions grow up to be Articles of Faith, and Ceremonies grow to be Necessary things. You know that this is the common way of propagating opinions in the world.

4. I have in another Book shewed you out of many of your own writers, the rise of divers of your vanities. And *Usher* hath told the Jesuite more. And so he hath told you of your thriving to your present height, in his Book *de succes. & statu Eccles.* And so hath *Mornay* in his *Mysterie of Iniquity*, and *Rivet* in the Defence of him against *Cofferellus*, and *Pet. Molinæus* hath purposely written a Book *de Novitate Papismi, & Antiquitate veri Christianismi*, shewing the Newness of Popery in the several parts of it. To these therefore I remit you for Answer to this Objection.

5. Can

5. Can you tell us your ſelves, when many of your Doctrines or practices ſprung up? When took you up your *Sabbaths faſt*, for which you have been condemned by a Council? You know that when the twentieth Canon of the Nicene Council was made, and when the Canons at *Trull.* were made, it was the Practice of the Church through the known world, to pray and perform other worſhip ſtanding, and to avoid kneeling on the Lords Day: Tell us when this Canon and Tradition was firſt violated by you, and by whom? It was once the cuſtom of your Church to give Infants the Euchariſt: Who firſt broke it off? It was once your practice to Communicate in both kinds: Who firſt denyed the Cup to the Laity? At firſt it was only a doubtful Opinion, that Saints are to be Prayed to, and the dead prayed for, which came into mens minds about the third or fourth Century: But who firſt made them Articles of faith? *Auguſtine* began to doubt, whether there were not ſome kind of Purgatory: But who firſt made this alſo a point of faith? Who was it that firſt added the Books of the *Maccabees*, and many others to the Canon of Scripture, contrary to the Council of *Laodicæa*, and all the reſt of the concent of Antiquity, which Dr. *Reignolds*, Dr. *Coſin* and others have produced? Who was it that firſt taught and practiſed the putting an Oath to all the Clergy of the Chriſtian Church within your power to be true to the Pope, and to obey him as the Vicar of Chriſt? Who firſt taught men to ſwear, that they would not interpret Scripture, but according to the unanimous Conſent of the Fathers? Who was the firſt that brought in the Doctrine or name of Tranſubſtantiation? and who firſt made it an Article of faith? Who firſt made it a point of faith to believe that there are juſt ſeven Sacraments, neither fewer nor more? Did any before the Council of

Trent

Trent swear men, to receive and profess without doubting, all things delivered by the Canons and Oecumenical Councils, when at the same time they cast off themselves the Canons of many General Councils, and so are generally and knowingly perjured? (as *e. g.* the twentieth Canon of *Nice* forementioned.) These and abundance more you know to be *Novelties* with you, if wilfulness or gross ignorance bear not rule with you; and without great impudence you cannot deny it. Tell us now when these first came up, and satisfie your selves.

One that was afterward your Pope (*Æneas Sylvius, Epist.* 288,) saith, that *before the Council of* Nice, *there was little respect had to the Church of* Rome. You see here the time mentioned, when your foundation was not laid.

Your Learned Cardinal *Nicol. Cusanus*, *lib de Concord. Cathol. c.* 13, &c. tells you how much your Pope hath gotten of late: and plainly tells you, [that *the Papacy* is *but of Positive right*; *and that Priests are equal*; *and that it is subjectional consent that gives the Pope and Bishops their Majority*; *and that the distinction of Dioceses*, *and that a Bishop be over Presbyters*, *are of Positive right*; *and that Christ gave no more to* Peter *than the rest*; *and that if the Congregate Church should choose the Bishop of* Trent *for their President and Head*, *he should be more properly* Peters *Successor than the Bishop of* Rome.] Tell us now when the contrary Doctrine first arose?

Gregory de Valentia (*de leg. usu Euchar. cap.* 10,) tells you that the *Receiving the Sacrament in one kind*, *began not by the decree of any Bishop*, *but by the very use of the Churches*, *and the consent of believers*: and tells you, that *it is unknown when that Custom first begun*, *or got head*, *but that it was General in the Latine*

tine Church, not long before the late Council of Constance. And may you not see in this, how other points came in?

If Pope *Zosimus* had but had his will, and the Fathers of the *Carthage* Council had not diligently discovered, shamed, and resisted his forgery, the world had received a new Nicene Canon, and we should never have known the Original of it.

It's a considerable Instance that *Usher* brings, of using the Church service in a known tongue. The Latine tongue was the Vulgar tongue, when the Liturgy and Scripture was first written in it; (at *Rome*, and, far and near, it was understood by all.) The service was not changed, as to the language; but the language it self changed: and so Scripture and Liturgy came to be in an unknown tongue. And when did the Latine tongue cease to be understood by all? Tell us what year, or by whom the change was made? Saith *Erasmus* (*Decl. ad censur. Paris. tit.* 12. *sect.* 41,) [*The Vulgar tongue was not taken from the people, but the people departed from it.*]

5. We are certain that your errors were not in the times of the Apostles, nor long after, and therefore we are sure that they are Innovations. And if I find a man in a Dropsie, or a Consumption, I would not tell him, that he is well, and ought not to seek remedy, unless he can tell when he began to be, ill and what caused it.

You take us to be Heretical: and yet you cannot tell us when our errors did first arise. Will you tell us of *Luther?* You know the *Albigenses*, whom you murdered by hundreds and thousands, were long before him. Do you know when they begun? Your *Reinerius* saith, that some said, they were from *Silvesters* dayes; and some said since the Apostles: but no other beginning do you know.

6. But

6. But to conclude, what need we any more, than to find you owning the very Doctrine and practice of Innovation? When you maintain that you can make us new Articles of faith, and new worship, and new Discipline, and that the Pope can dispense with the Scriptures, and such like; what reason have we to believe that your Church abhorreth Novelty? If you deny any of this, I prove it.

Pope *Leo* the tenth among other of *Luthers* opinions, reckoneth and opposeth this as Heretical, [*It is certain that it is not in the hand of the Church or Pope, to make Articles of faith:*] (*in Bulla cont. Luth.*)

The Council of *Constance* that took the supremacy justly from the Pope, did unjustly take the Cup from the Laity in the Eucharist, [*Licet in primitiva Ecclesia hujusmodi Sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus sub utraque specie*, i. e. *Though in the primitive Church this Sacrament was received by Believers under both kinds.*]

The Council of *Trent* say, *Sess.* 21. *cap.* 1, 2, that [*This power was alway in the Church: that in dispensing the Sacraments, saving the substance of them, it might ordain or change things, as it should judge most expedient to the profit of the receiver.*]

Vasquez To. 2. *Disp.* 216. *N.* 60, saith [*Though we should grant that this was a precept of the Apostles, nevertheless the Church and Pope might on just causes abrogate it: For the Power of the Apostles was no greater than the power of the Church and Pope, in bringing in Precepts.*]

These I cited in another Treatise against Popery, *page* 365. Where also I added that of Pope *Innocent* [*Secundum plenitudinem potestatis*, &c. *By the fulness of our power, we can dispense with the Law above Law.*] And the Glos's that oft saith [*The Pope dispenseth*

seth against the Apostle; against the Old Testament. The Pope dispenseth with the Gospel, interpreting it.] And Gregory de Valent. saying (Tom. 4. disp. 6. q. 8,) [Certainly some things in later times are more rightly constituted in the Church than they were in the beginning.] And of Cardinal Perron's saying, lib. 2. Obs. 3. cap. 3. page 674, against King James, of the Authority of the Church to alter matters conteined in the Scripture; and his instance [of the form of Sacraments being alterable; and the Lords command [Drink ye all of it] mutable and dispensable.] And Tolet's [It's certain, that all things instituted by the Apostles were not of Divine right.] Andradius (Defens. Concil. Trid. lib. 2. pag. 236, [Hence it is plain that they do not err that say the Popes of Rome may sometime dispense with Laws made by Paul and the four first Councils ——.] And Bzovius [The Roman Church using Apostolical power, doth according to the Condition of times, change all things for the better.] And yet will you not give us leave to take you for changers and Novelists?

But let us add to these witnesses, some more of your worthies. August. Triumph. de Ancon. q. 5. art. 1, saith, [To make a new Creed, belongs only to the Pope; because he is the Head of the Christian faith, by whose authority all things belonging to faith are confirmed and strengthened ——.] And Art. 2, [As he may make a new Creed, so he may multiply new Articles upon Articles.] And (in Præfat. sum. ad Johan. 22,) he saith, that [the Popes power is Infinite; because the Lord is great, and his strength great, and of his greatness there is no end.] And q. 36, ad 6, he saith, that [the Pope giveth the Motion of Direction, and the sense of Knowledge, into

into all the members of the Church; For in him we live and move and have our being ——— . *And the Will of God, and consequently the Popes Will, who is his Vicar, is the first and chief cause of all motions corporal and spiritual.*] And then no doubt may change without blame.

Abbas Panormitan. in cap. C. Christus de hæret. n. 2, saith, [*The Pope can bring in a new Article of faith.*] And *Petr. de Anchoran. in idic.* [*The Pope can make new Articles of faith; that is, such as now ought to be believed, when before they ought not to be believed.*]

Turrecremat. sum. de Eccl. lib. 2. *cap.* 203, saith, that [*the Pope is the Measure, and Rule, and Science of things to be believed.*] And *August. de Ancona* shews us [that the *Judgement of God is not higher than the Popes, but the same; and that therefore no man may appeal from the Pope to God:*] (qu. 6. art. 1.) And therefore be not offended, if we suppose you to have changes.

A

A Confutation of a Popiſh Manuſcript on this point.

Juſt as I was writing this, I received another Popiſh *MS.* ſent from *Wolverhampton* to *Sturbridge*, to which I ſhall return an anſwer before I go to the next point.

Pap. M. S. *An Argument for the Church.*

IT *will not be denyed but that the Church of* Rome *was once a moſt pure, excellent, flouriſhing and Mother Church; and her faith renowned in the whole world,* Rom. 1. 8. & 6. & 16. Whites Def. p. 555. *King* James *ſpeech to the Parliament.* Whitaker *in his Anſwer to Dr.* Sanders. Fulk. cap. 21. Theſ. 7. Reynolds *in his fifth Concluſion.*

This Church could not ceaſe to be ſuch, but ſhe muſt fall either by Apoſtaſie, Hereſie, or Schiſm.

Apoſtaſie is not only a renouncing of the faith of Chriſt; but of the name and Title of Chriſtianity. No man will ſay that the Church of Rome *had ſuch a fall, or fell ſo.*

Hereſie is an adheſion or faſt cleaving to ſome private

or

or ſingular Opinion, or error in faith, contrary to the generally approved Doctrine of the Church.

If the Church of Rome *did ever adhere to any ſingular or new opinion, diſagreeable to the common received Doctrine of the Chriſtian world, I pray you ſatisfie me in theſe particulars,*

1. *By what General Council was ſhe ever condemned?*
2. *Which of the Fathers ever writ againſt her?*
3. *By what Authority was ſhe otherwiſe reproved?*

For it ſeems to be a thing very incongruous, that ſo great a Church ſhould be condemned by every private perſon, who hath a mind to condemn her.

Schiſm is a departure or diviſion from the unity of the Church, whereby the bond and Communion held with ſome former Church is broken and diſſolved.

If ever the Church of Rome *divided her ſelf from any body of faithful Chriſtians, or broke Communion, or went forth from the Society of any Elder Church, I pray you ſatisfie me in theſe particulars,*

1. *Whoſe company did ſhe leave?*
2. *From what body went ſhe forth?*
3. *Where was the true Church ſhe forſook?*

For it appears not a little ſtrange, that a Church ſhould be accounted Schiſmatical, when there cannot be aſſigned any other Church different from her (which from age to age ſince Chriſts time hath continued viſible,) from whence ſhe departed.]

Thus far the Papiſts Manuſcript.

An

An Answer to the foregoing Argument.

IF the Author of this Argument thinks as he speaks, it's a case to be lamented with tears of blood, that the Church of Christ should be abused, and the souls of men deluded by men of so great ignorance. But if he know that he doth but juggle and deceive, it's as lamentable that any matter of Salvation should fall into such hands.

1. This Argument I have before answered, *Detect.* 13. The word Church here is ambiguous, and either signifieth, 1. A particular Church, which is an Association of Christians for personal Communion in Gods worship. 2. Or divers such Associations or Churches Associated for Communion by their officers or delegates, for unity sake. 3. Or else it may signifie some one Mistris Church that is the Ruler of all the rest in the world. 4. Or else it may signifie the Universal (Catholick) Church it self, which containeth all the particular Churches in the world.

The Papist should not have plaid either the blind man or the Jugler by confounding these, and never telling us which he means. 1. For the first, we grant him that *Rome* was once an excellent flourishing Church: And so was *Ephesus*, *Hierusalem*, *Philippi*, *Colosse* and many more.

2. As to the second sense, it is humane, or from Church custom, so to take the word Church; for Scripture, that I find, doth not so use it: But for the thing, we are indifferent: Though it cannot be proved that in Scripture times *Rome* had any more than a particular Church; yet it's all one as to our cause.

3. As to the third and fourth senses, we deny, as confidently as we do that the Sun is darkness, that ever in Scripture times *Rome* was either a Mother to all Churches, or the Ruler and Mistris of all, or yet the Universal Church it self. Prove this, and I will turn Papist.

But there's not a word for it in the Texts cited, but an intimation of much against it. *Paul* calleth *Rome* a Church, and commendeth its faith. True, but doth he not so by the *Thessalonians, Colossians, Ephesians, Philippians, &c.* and *John* by the *Philadelphians, Pergamus, Thyatira,* and others, as well? And will not this prove that *Rome* was but such a particular Church as one of them?

The citations of Protestants are done it seems by one that never read them, nor would have others read them; which makes him turn us to whole books to search for them, if we have nothing else to do, and to miscited places. But we know that all our Divines confess that *Rome* was once a true and famous particular Church, but never the Universal Church, nor the Ruler of the world, or of all other Churches, in *Pauls* dayes. Would you durst lay your cause on this, and put it to the tryal. Why else did never *Paul* make one word of mention of this Power and honour, nor send other Churches to her to be Governed?

And now I pray consider to what purpose is the rest of your reasoning? What is it to me, whether *Rome* be turned either Apostate, Heretical, or Schismatical, any more than whether *Jerusalem, Ephesus, Philippi,* or any other Church be so faln? If you are not faln I am glad of it; if you are I am sorry for it; and so I have done with you (unless I knew how to recover you.) Would you not laugh even at the Church of *Jerusalem* that was truly the Mother Church of the world, if they should

ſhould thus reaſon [*We are not faln away: therefore we muſt Rule over all the world, and no man is a Chriſtian that doth not obey us?*] This is the ſport you make in the cheating of ſouls.

Well; but let us follow you, though our cauſe be not concerned in it. 1. I anſwer, that we accuſe you not of renouncing the name of Chriſt. 2. We muſt needs fear, that according to your own definition of Hereſie, you are guilty of many Hereſies.

And to your Queſtions, I anſwer. 1. I pray you tell us what General Councils did ever condemn one half of the Hereſies mentioned by *Epiphanius*, *Auguſtine* or *Philaſtrius*? Was there ever a greater rabble of Hereſies than before ever a General Council was known? and were they dead and buried before the firſt General Council was born? 2. Did you not ſmile when you wrote theſe deluſory Queſtions; How can a General Council condemn you, or any great part of the Church? for inſtance the Greeks, *&c.* If you be not there, it's not a General Council? And will you be there to condemn your ſelves? You have more wit, and leſs grace than ſo. And I pray, what General Council did ever condemn the Greeks, for thoſe many errours charged on them? If the Greeks themſelves were not there, it was not a General Council: ſo conſiderable a part are they of the Church. And what General Council hath condemned the Abaſſines, Egyptians, *&c.*

3. Do you think General Councils are ſo ſtark mad or horridly impious, as to condemn ſo many Kingdoms with one condemnation, for Hereſie? Why, they know that men muſt be heard, before they be condemned, and a Kingdom conſiſteth of many millions of ſouls. And it is not enough to know every mans faith, if we know the faith of the King, or Pope, or Arch-biſhop, or

Bishops: And how long shall they be examining each person in many Kingdoms?

4. But yet I can say more of your Church than of others. He that kills the Head, kills the Man: Your Usurping Head is an Essential part of your New-formed Church: But your Head hath been condemned by Councils; therefore your Church in its essential part hath been condemned by Councils. Do you not know that all the world (as well as the feigned Council *Sinuessan.*) condemned your Pope *Marcellinus* for Offering to Idols? Know you not that two or three General Councils condemned Pope *Honorius* as a Monothelite? Yes: No doubt you know it. Know you not that the second General Council of *Ephesus* condemned and excommunicated your Pope? And that the Council of *Basil*, called by him, did the like? If you do not, see *Bellarmines* parallel of them *de Conciliis lib.* 2. *cap.* 11. Do I need to tell you what the Council of *Constance* did? Or for what *John* 22, *alias* 23, and *John* 13, and other Popes were deposed by Councils?

2. And for Fathers; Do I need to tell you how many condemned *Marcellinus*, *Liberius*, *Honorius* and others? How oft *Hilary Pictav.* (*in fragmentis in recit. Epist. Liberii,*) doth cry out, *Anathema tibi Liberi, prævaricator*: presuming to curse and excommunicate your Pope. Need I tell you what *Tertullian* saith against *Zepherinus*? Yea what *Alphonsus à Castro*, and divers of your own, say against *Liberius*, *Honorius*, *Anastasius*, *Celestine*; and tell us that many Popes have been *Hereticks*? At least give us leave to believe *Pope Adrian* the sixth himself. Read *Dom. Bannes in* 2. 2. *q.* 1. *art.* 10, where he proves at large against *Pighius*, that a Pope may be an *Heretick*, and laughs at *Pighius* that now, after two hundred years, would prove them false witnesses, which write that Pope *Honorius* was condemned

condemned for an Heretick by three Popes, *viz. Agatho*, *Leo* the second, and *Adrian* the second.

3. But perhaps you'l say, that *though your Popes have been condemned by Councils, yet so have not your maintained doctrines. Answ.* Yes, that they have too. Did not the Councils at *Constantinople* condemn the Doctrine of the second *Nicene* Council for Image-worship, and the Council at *Frankford* do the like? And those two at *Constantinople* were as much General as your Council of *Trent* was, and much more.

And yet that same Council at *Nice* did condemn the doctrine of St. *Thom. Aquinas*, and your Doctors commonly, of worshipping the Image of Christ, and Cross, and sign of the Cross, with *Latria*, divine worship.

And did not your General Councils at *Laterane* and *Florence* declare that the Pope is above a Council, and that they cannot depose him? *&c.* And yet your General Councils at *Constance* and *Basil* determine the contrary as an Article of Faith; and expresly affirm the former to be Heresie. See then your own doctrine, even in a fundamental point, condemned by General Councils of your own, (which side soever you take, the Popes, or the Councils.)

And did not the sixth Council of *Carthage*, of which St. *Augustine* was a principal member, not only detect Pope *Zosimus* forged Canon of *Nice*, but also openly and prevalently resist and reject your Usurpation, and refuse your Legates, and Appeals to you? If you would cloak this, believe your own Pope *Boniface*, *Epist. ad Eulalium*, saying [*Aurelius sometime Bishop of* Carthage, *with his Colleagues, did begin, by the Devils instigation, to wax proud against the Church of* Rome, *in the times of our Predecessors*, Boniface *and* Celestine.]

And if you have learnt to except againſt this Epiſtle, ſee your Biſhop *Lindanus* juſtifying it, *Panopl. l. cap.* 89. Or at leaſt believe your Champion *Harding* againſt *Jewels* Challenge, *art.* 4. *ſect.* 19, [*After the whole African Church had perſevered in ſchiſm the ſpace of twenty years, and had removed themſelves from the obedience of the Apoſtolick ſeat, being ſeduced by* Aurelius *Biſhop of* Carthage.] Again note, that *Auſtin* was one of them.

But you'l ſay, that this was not a General Council. *Anſw.* True; for when part riſeth againſt part, it cannot be the whole that is on either ſide.

Moreover, Do you not know that the Greeks have condemned you oft? And truly their Councils have been much more General than yours at *Trent* was, where about forty Biſhops altered the Canon of Scripture, and made Tradition equal with it. I think verily this one County would have afforded a far better Council of a greater number.

But I'le once more name one General Council that hath condemned your very foundation; and that is the fourth General Council at *Calcedon* before mentioned, *Act.* 15. *Can.* 28, *& Act.* 16, where you may find, 1. That the ancient Priviledges of the Roman Throne were given them by the Fathers (in Council.) 2. That the Reaſon was, becauſe *Rome* was the Imperial City. 3. That they give Equal Priviledges to the ſeat of *Conſtantinople*, becauſe it was now become New *Rome*. 4. That the Roman Legates would not be preſent at this act. 5. But the next day when they did appear, and pretended that this act was forced, the Biſhops all cryed, [*No man was compelled; It's a juſt decree: We all ſay thus; We all approve it: Let that ſtand that is decreed; It's all right.*]

6. Here

6. Here ſpecially note, that this General Council thought they needed not the Popes Approbation for the validity of their Decrees; when they paſs them, and take them for valid, even contrary to the will of the Pope. Speak, you that bear the leaſt reverence to a General Council; Did this Council think that their Decrees were invalid, if the Pope approve them not? You ſee, if you be not wilfully blind, they did not. And who is now to be believed? *Bellarmine* and his party, and the preſent prevalent party of the Papiſts, that ſay, Councils not approved by the Pope are invalid or without authority: or the Council of *Calcedon*, that thought otherwiſe?

7. Note that the Popes Legates called this [*An humbling, and depreſſing, and wronging of the Papacy; and therefore entred their diſſent.*] *See* Bellarmines *Confeſſion lib. 2. de Pontif. cap. 17. Binnius* Notes on this *Council.* Baronius *an.* 451.

8. Note alſo that the ſhifts of *Bellarm. Binnius, Baronius, Becanus, Gretſer*, &c. are apparently falſe, that ſay this Canon was ſurreptitiouſly brought into the Council. For *Ætius, Act.* 16. openly profeſſed the contrary, and all the Biſhops profeſſed their conſent to the laſt.

9. Note alſo that this is one of the four Great Councils which the Papiſts themſelves compare to the four Goſpels; and in it were ſix hundred and thirty Fathers.

10. Note alſo that this great Council is againſt them, and on the Proteſtant ſide, in the very foundation of all our differences, Whether the Roman Priviledges be *jure divino* or *humano?* And though it be but the Priviledges, and not the now-claimed Vicarſhip that was in Queſtion, yet the Concluſion is the ſtronger againſt them, becauſe the leſſer was denyed.

But their laſt ſhift is, that this Clauſe or Canon was not approved, and ſo is Null. 1. Mark then, you that wrote this Manuſcript, that we have General Councils againſt you; but we want the Popes Approbation. And, in good ſadneſs, was that the meaning of your Queſtion [*What Council? that is, What Pope, condemned our Church?*] Can it be expected that this one man ſhould condemn himſelf? or, Can you be no Heretick till then?

2. But let it be ſo this once: Did not your Pope approve of this Council, when *Gregory* the firſt did liken it with the other three to the four Goſpels? and ſaid of this [*Tota devotione Complector: integerrima approbatione cuſtodio:*] [*I embrace it with my whole devotion: I keep it with moſt entire approbation.*' *Greg.* 1. *Regiſt. l.* 1. *Epiſt.* 24. *Cited in the Decrees, Diſt.* 15. *c.* 2. I think this is expreſly a full Approbation, not without excepting any part only, but excluding all ſuch exceptions. And the like Approbation of *Gelaſius* in the Roman Council, is cited there alſo in the Decrees, *ibid. pag.* 33.

I did alſo before inſtance in the ſixth General Council againſt you, approved by Pope *Adrian* in his Epiſtle to *Tharaſius*, in the ſecond Nicene Council.

And indeed it is no hard matter to prove you condemned by your own Popes alſo. If you could but underſtand the plaineſt words, in a matter that is againſt your opinions and wills, there needed no talk to perſwade you, that Pope *Gregory* the firſt condemned the Title of *Univerſal Biſhop or Patriarch*; profeſſing earneſtly that he was the forerunner of Antichriſt that would uſurp it. But the plain truth is, as ſad experience teacheth us, no words of Fathers, Popes or Councils, much leſs of Scripture, are intelligible to you, when your wills are againſt the matter. But we may truly ſay of you,

that

that lay all on the will of the Pope, as *Auſtins* Obſervator, your *Lodovicus Vives* freely ſpeaketh, (*in ſchol. in Auguſt. lib.* 20. *de Civit. Dei, cap.* 26,) [*Thoſe are taken by them for Edicts and Councils, which make for them* (or are on their ſide ;) *the reſt they no more regard than a meeting of women in a work-houſe or a waſhing place.*] Do you underſtand this language of one of your own, (but too honeſt to have much company ?)

Well ; but you have a third Queſtion, [*By what Authority was ſhe otherwiſe reproved ?*] Anſw. By the Authority of that Precept, *Levit.* 19. 17, and many the like. By the ſame Authority that *Paul* reproved *Peter*, *Gal.* 2, and withſtood him to the face. By ſuch Authority as any man may ſeek to quench a fire in his neighbours houſe : or pull a man out of the water that is drowning : or as any one Paſtor may reprove another when he ſinneth. By the ſame Authority as *Irenæus* rebuked *Victor*, and the Aſian Biſhops withſtood him ; and as *Cyprian* and the Council of *Carthage* reproved *Stephen* ; and the reſt aforecited did what they did. By as good Authority as the Church of *Rome* condemneth the Greek Church, doth the Greek Church, and many another, condemn the Church of *Rome*.

3. The next caſe is about the Roman *Schiſm*. To your Queſtions, I anſwer, 1. To Queſtion whether Papiſts be Schiſmaticks, is to queſtion whether *Ethiopians* be black. Do you not at this day divide from all the Chriſtian world, ſave your ſelves ? Do you not unchurch moſt of the Chriſtians on earth : (O dreadful preſumption ! when Chriſt is ſo tender of his intereſt and his ſervants, and is bound, as it were, by ſo many promiſes to ſave them and not forſake them.) You ask, *What Church you left ? and when was it ? and whoſe*

whose company? Senseless Questions. By a Church, if you mean the Universal Church, there is but One in all; and therefore one Universal Church cannot forsake another: But when part of it forsaketh the other part, and arrogateth the title of the whole to themselves, do you doubt whether this be Schism? If you mean a particular Church: How can *Spain*, *Italy*, *France*, and many more Kingdoms, go out of a particular Church, that contain so many hundred particular Churches in them? No more than *London* can go out of *Pauls* Church. The Catholick is but One, containing all true Christians on earth: and you have been guilty of a most horrid Schism, as ever the Church knew. For, 1. You have set up a Church in the Church: An Universal Church in the Universal Church: A new form destructive to the old. Your Pope, as Christ-representative, is now an Essential part of it, and no man is a member of it, that is not a member of the Popes body, and subject to him. So that even the *Antipodes*, and the poor *Abassines*, that know not whether the Pope be fish or flesh, or never heard of such a name or thing, must all be unchristened, unchurched and damned, if you be Judges. Yea and *Bellarmine* tells us (which indeed your Church Constitution doth infer,) that all that are duly baptized, are interpretatively or implicitely baptized into the Pope.

2. And as you have devised a New Catholick Church, so you hereby cast off and disown all the Christians of the world that be not of your party, determining it as *de fide*, that none of them can be saved: Who yet had rather venture on your Curse and Censure, than into your Heresie and Schism.

3. And hereby you fix your selves in this Schism, and put us (that unfeignedly long for peace,) out of all Hope of ever having Peace with you; because you will

will hearken to it on no terms, but that all men become ſubjects to your uſurping Repreſentative-Chriſt: which we dare as ſoon leap into the fire as do. Do you know now where the Church or Body was that you forſook? It was all over the world where ever there were any Chriſtians.

Were it not a great Schiſm, think you, if a few Anabaptiſts ſhould ſay, *We are the whole Church, and all others are Hereticks or Schiſmaticks?* Or was it not a great Schiſm of the Donatiſts to arrogate that title to themſelves, and unchurch ſo many others? And what Church did they forſake? *Auguſtine* tells them over and over, what the Catholick Church was that they withdrew from; Even all true Chriſtians diſperſed over the earth: Or that Church which begun at *Hieruſalem*, and thence diffuſed it ſelf through the world. But he never blames them for ſeparating from the Univerſal Roman Head or Vicar. But from the Church of *Rome*, as a conſpicuous combination of particular Churches, *Optatus* and He, do blame them for withdrawing; as alſo from other Churches.

What if *John* of *Conſtantinople*, in proſecution of his title of Univerſal Patriarch, had concluded as you, that none in the world are Chriſts members but his members, nor of the Church but his ſubjects, had not this been a notorious ſchiſm? Tell us then what Church he had forſaken, and anſwer your ſelf.

But your laſt Caution in a parentheſis, doth condemn your ſelves. What! Muſt that Church that's true be viſible from Chriſts time? Then, as *Conſtantinople*, nor moſt other, were never true Churches (which is falſe); ſo *Rome* it ſelf was never a true Church, (which is falſe alſo.) Did you think that there was a Church at *Rome* in Chriſts time? Sure you are not ſo ignorant. By this Rule there ſhould

be

be no true Church, but that at *Jeruſalem*, and thoſe in *Judæa*.

But ſuppoſe you had ſaid, [*ſince the Apoſtles time.*] This alſo had excluded moſt Churches on earth. But if you mean the Univerſal Church; we grant you eaſily, that it hath been viſible ever ſince Chriſts time: but not alway in one place or Country. Is not the greater part of Chriſtians in the world, whom you ſchiſmatically unchurch, a viſible company? Doubtleſs you know they are. Yea the *Abaſſines* and many Churches that, being out of the Roman Empire, did never ſo much as ſubmit to your Primacy of Order, nor had you ever any thing to do with them (more than to own them as Chriſtians,) yet now are condemned by your Arrogancy, becauſe they will not begin, in the end of the world, to enter into a new Church, which they nor their Forefathers had ever any dependence on. It was a ſhrewd anſwer of an old woman, that the Emperour of *Habaſſia*'s Mother gave to *Gonzal. Rodericus* the Jeſuite, preſſing her to be ſubject to the Pope as the Vicar of Chriſt, or elſe ſhe could not be ſubject to Chriſt, [*Neque ego, inquit illa, neque mei, ſancto Petro obedientiam negamus. In eadem nunc ſumus fide, in qua fuimus ab initio: Ea ſi recta non erat, cur per tot ætates ac ſecula nemo repertus eſt, qui nos errantes commoneret?*] *i. e.* [We are are in the ſame Belief as we were from the beginning: If it were not right, why did no man in ſo many ages warn us of our errour till now?] Mark here a double Argument coucht againſt the Pope: One from Tradition, even Apoſtolical Tradition; (for *Godignus* himſelf ſaith, that no man doubts but *Ethiopia* received the faith from the beginning, even from the *Eunuch* and St. *Matthew*.) The other is, that ſure that Pope, that cannot in ſo many ages look after his flock, no not ſo much as to ſend one man to tell them that they erred

till

till about one thouſand five hundred years after Chriſt, was never intended by Chriſt to be the Univerſal Governour of the world. What! Will Chriſt ſet any on an Impoſſible work? Or make it ſo neceſſary to people to obey one that they never ſo much as hear from? But what ſaid the Jeſuite to the old woman! Why he told her, [*Non potuiſſe Romanum Pontificem, qui totius Chriſti Eccleſiæ paſtor eſt, præteritis retro annis, Doctores in Abaſſiam mittere, eo quod Mahumetani omnia circumdarent, nec ullum ad ipſos aditum relinquerent. Nunc vero jam aperta, maritima ad Æthiopiam via, id præſtare quod nequivit prius.*] *i. e.* [The Pope of *Rome* who is the Paſtor of the whole Church of Chriſt, was not able in the years paſt to ſend Doctors into *Habaſſia*, becauſe the Mahometans compaſſed all, and left not any paſſage to them. But now the ſeas are open, he can do that which he could not before.] *Liter. Gonzal. Roder. in Godign. de Reb. Abaſſ. lib.* 2. *cap.* 18. *pag.* 324. A fair anſwer. As if Chriſt had ſet either the Pope, or the *Abaſſines* an impoſſible task; and appointed a Governour that for ſo many hundred years could not govern: or the people muſt be ſo many hundred years no Chriſtians, though they believed in Chriſt, till the Pope could ſend to them? And how ſhould theſe and all ſuch Countries ſend Biſhops to a General Council?

As your own *Canus, Loc. Theol.* ſaith of the Jeſuites; ſo ſay I of your New Church, [*Vocati eſtis ad ſocietatem Jeſu Chriſti, quæ ſine dubio ſocietas, cum Chriſti Eccleſia ſit, qui titulum ſibi illum arrogant, hi videant, an Hæreticorum more penes ſe Eccleſiam exiſtere mentiantur.* i.e. *You are called to the ſociety of Jeſus Chriſt, which ſociety being undoubtedly the Church of Chriſt, let them ſee to it, that arrogate this title to themſelves, whether they do not imitate hereticks by*

a Lying

a Lying affirmation that the Church is only with them.] *Lib.* 4. *c.* 2. *fol.* (*mihi*) 116.

But we do not hence conclude that all that have lived and dyed in your profession, have been no members of the Church, because that your Church is guilty of Heresie, and notoriously of Schism. For we know that millions that live among you consent not to your usurpations; Nay do not so much as understand your errours thereabout. And some hold them but Notionally as uneffectual Opinions: And every one is not a Heretick that holdeth a point that is judged Heretical, and which is Heresie in another, that holdeth it in another sort. And there are errours called Heresies by most, which are not destructive to the Essentials of Christianity, but only to some Integral part. And there is a schism that doth not unchurch men, as well as a schism that doth, (of which this is no place to treat.) But *ad hominem*, me thinks your own writers put you hard to it, who conclude (as *Bellarmine* and many more do, though *Alphonsus à Castro* and others be against it,) that Hereticks and Schismaticks are no members of the Church. And *Melch. Canus* (*Loc. Theol. lib.* 4. *cap.* 2. *fol.* 117,) saith, [*That Hereticks are no parts of the Church, is the common conclusion of all Divines; not only of those that have written of late, but of them also that by their Antiquity are esteemed the most Noble: This is attested by* Cyprian, Augustine, Gregory, *the two Councils of* Lateran *and* Florence. *Rightly therefore did Pope* Nicholas *define that the Church is a collection of Catholicks.*] If this be true, it is an Article of faith: And then *Alphonsus à Cast.* and all of his mind are Hereticks and lost men. And I pray you note, what a case you are in. Two Approved General Councils have determined that a Heretick is no member of the Church: But multitudes of your own writers, and ☞ Pope *Adrian*, and many more

more of your Popes have judged that a Pope may be a Heretick : and consequently no member of the Church. And consequently judge what's become of your Church, when an Essential part of it is no part of the Church.

Your common shift (which *Canus ibid.* and others fly to,) is, that *He must be a judged Heretick before he is dismembred.* But 1. Sure that is but for manifestation to men; for before God he is the same, if men never judge him. 2. Where the case is notorious, the offender is *ipso jure* cut off. 3. Then it is in the Popes Power, to let whole millions of Hereticks to be still parts of the Church: And so the world shall be Christians or no Christians as he please. And why may he not let Turks and Infidels on the same grounds be parts of the Church? For he may forbear to judge them, if that will serve. 4. Then all the Christians in the world that the Pope hath not yet judged and cast out, are members of the Church: And then millions and millions are of the Church that never were subjects of the Pope. If you say, It is enough that there is a General condemnation, of all that are guilty as they are. I answer, then it is enough to cut off a Pope, that there was a General condemnation against such as he.

5. But, if all this satisfie you not, yet I told you before, that two or three Councils and three Popes did all judge Pope *Honorius* guilty of Heresie, (and consequently both Popes and General Councils have judged that a Pope may be an Heretick): therefore you have been judged Heretical in your Head, which is an essential part of your Church.

And thus I have shewed you what is the schism of the Church of *Rome*, which being but a part, hath attempted to cut off all the rest, and so hath made a new pretended Catholick Church. As a part of the

Old

Old Church, which consisteth of all Christians united in Christ, we confess, all those of you still to be a part, that destroy not this Christianity: But as you are new gathered to a Christ-Representative, or Vicar General, we deny you to be any Church of Christ. If you be Church members, or saved, it must be as Christians; but never as Papists. For a Papist may be a Christian, but not as a Papist.

And if yet you cannot see the Church that you separate from, open your eyes and look into much of *Europe*, and all over *Asia* almost, where are any Christians: look into *Armenia*, *Palestine*, *Egypt*, *Ethiopia*, and many other Countries, and you shall find that you are but a smaller part of the Church. If you will not believe what I have before proved of this, hear what your own say: *Anton. Marinarius* in the Council of *Trent* complaineth, [*that the Church is shut up in the Corners of* Europe, *and yet Domestick enemies arise, that waste this portion shut up in a corner.*]

Sonnius Bishop of Antwerp, (*in Demonstrat. Relig. Christian. lib. 2. Tract. 5. c. 3,*) saith, [*I pray you what room hath the Catholick Church now in the habitable world? Scarce three elnes long in comparison of that vastness which the Satanical Church doth possess.*]

If yet you boast that you have the same seat that formerly you had. I answer, So have the Bishops of *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, and others whom you condemn. And we say as *Gregory Nazianz. Orat. de laud. Athanasii* [*It is a succession of Godliness that is properly to be esteemed a succession. For he that professeth the same doctrine of faith, is also partaker of the same throne: But he that embraceth the contrary belief, ought to be judg'd an adversary though he be in the throne. This indeed hath the name of Succession; but the other hath the Thing it self, and the Truth.* And he next addeth such words as utterly break

break your ſucceſſion in pieces: ſaying, [*For he that breaketh in by force* (as abundance of Popes did,) *is not to be eſteemed a ſucceſſor; but rather he that ſuffereth force: nor he that breaketh the Laws; but he that is choſen in manner agreeable to the Laws: nor he that holdeth contrary tenets; but he that is endued with the ſame faith: Unleſs any man will call him a Succeſſor, as we ſay a ſickneſs ſucceedeth health, or darkneſs ſucceedeth light, and a ſtorm ſucceeds a calm, or madneſs* (*or diſtraction*) *ſucceedeth prudence.*] Thus Nazianz. pag. 377.

We conclude therefore with one of your own, (*Lyra Gloſ. in Matth.* 16,) [*Becauſe many Princes and chief Prieſts* (*or Popes*) *and other inferiors, have been found to Apoſtatize, the Church conſiſteth in thoſe perſons in whom is the true knowledge and confeſſion of Faith and Verity.*] And ſo much to this empty Manuſcript.

CHAP. XXXVI.

Detect. 27. ANother of their Deceits is this: *To charge us with introducing New Articles of faith or points of Religion, becauſe we contradict the New Articles which they introduce, and then they require us to prove our Doctrines which are but the Negatives of theirs.*

We receive no Doctrines of faith or worſhip but what was delivered by the Apoſtles to the Church: Theſe men bring in abundance of new ones, and ſay, without proof, that they received them from the Apoſtles. And becauſe we refuſe to receive their Novelties, they call our Rejections of them [*The Doctrines of our Religion*;] and feign us to be the Innovators. And by

this device, it is in the Power of any Heretick to force the Church to take up, such as these men call, New points of faith. If a Papist shall say, that besides the Lords Prayer Christ gave his Disciples another Form, or two, or three, or many; or that he gave them ten New Commandments not mentioned in the Bible; or that he oft descended after his Ascension, and conversed with them; or that there are many more worlds of men besides this earth; or that Christ instituted twenty Sacraments, how should we deal with these men, but by denying their fictions as sinful Novelty, and rejecting them as corrupt additions to the Faith? And were this any Novelty in us? And should they bid us prove in the expres words of Scripture or antiquity, our Negative Propositions, [that Christ gave but one form of prayer, that he did not oft descend, that he gave no more Decalogues, Sacraments, *&c?*] Is it not a sufficient proof of any of these, that they are not written; and that no Tradition of them from the Apostles is proved; and that they that hold the Affirmative, and introduce the Novelty, must prove, and not we? Our Articles of faith are the same, and not increased, nor any new ones added: But the Papists come in with a new faith, as large as all the Novelties in the Decretals and the Councils: And these innovations of theirs we reject. Now our Rejections do not increase the Articles of our faith, no more than my beating a dog out of my house, or keeping out an enemy, or sweeping out the filth, doth enlarge my house, or increase my family. They do not take all the Anathema's and Rejections in their own Councils, to be Canons or Articles of faith.

For example, The Pope hath made it an Article of faith, [*that no Scripture is to be interpreted but according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.*] This we

we reject, and make it no Article of our faith, but an erroneous Novelty. Do we hereby make a new Article, because we reject a new one of theirs? (yea, a part of the Oath of their Church made by Pope *Pius* after the Council of *Trent.*) 1. If this be an Article, prove it if you can. 2. If it be a Truth, and no Novelty, I pray you tell us, which be Fathers, and which not? and help us to know certainly, when we have all, or the unanimous Consent. And then tell us, whether every man is not forsworn with you, that interprets any text of Scripture before he have read all the Fathers; or any text which six of them never expounded; or any text which they do not unanimously agree on? And yet (though it be not our necessary task,) we can easily prove to you, that this is a New Article of your devising. 1. Because else no man must expound any Scripture at all before these Fathers were born. ☞ For how could the Church before them have their unanimous consent? And 2. Because that otherwise these Fathers themselves wanted an Article of faith; unless it was an Article to them, that they must expound no Scripture but by their own Consent. 3. Because these Fathers do few of them expound all, or half, or the twentieth part of the Scripture. 4. Because they took liberty to disagree among themselves, and therefore do not unanimously consent in abundance of particular texts. 5. Because they tell us that they are fallible, and bid us not take it on their trust. 6. Because the Apostles have left us no such rule or precept, but much to the contrary. 7. Your own Doctors (for all their Oath,) do commonly charge the Fathers with error and misexpounding Scripture, as I shewed before, *Canus* and many others charge *Cajetan*, (a Cardinal and pillar in your Church,) with making it his practice to differ from the Fathers, and choosing

expositions purposely for the Novelty; *pro more suo, as his custom:* And when he hath highly extolled *Cajetan*, (*Loc. Theol. lib.* 7. *pag.* 223,) he adds, that [*yet his Doctrine was defiled with a Leprosie of errors, by an affection and lust of Curiosity, or confidence on his wit, expounding Scripture as he list; happily indeed for the most part, but in some few places more acutely than happily: because he regarded not antient Tradition, and was not verst in the reading of the Fathers, and would not learn from them the Mysteries of the sealed book.*] And in another place he blames him, that he alway followed the Hebrew and Greek text. And many other Papists, by him and others, are blamed for the same faults. *Andradius*, and more of the later, plead for it. And yet these men are counted members of your Church, that go against an Article of your new faith and Oath.

So, Transubstantiation is one of your New Articles in that Oath. Do we make a New one now if we reject it? Or need we be put to prove the Negative? And yet we can easily do it. And *Edm. Albertinus* (among many others) hath done it unanswerably.

Another of your Articles is, that [*it belongeth to your Holy Mother the Church to judge of the true sense of Scripture.*] And you mean the *Roman* Church; and that they must judge of it for all the Christian world. Prove this to be the Antient Doctrine if you can. If we reject this Novelty, are we Innovators? or need we prove the Negative? And yet we can do it, and have oft done it at large. Did *Athanasius*, *Basil*, *Nazianzen*, *Nyssen*, *Augustine*, *Hierom*, *Chrysostom*, *Epiphanius*, and the rest of the Fathers, send to *Rome* for the sense of the Scriptures which they expound; or did they procure the Popes Approbation before

before any of them publiſhed their Commentaries? You know ſure that they did not.

The like may be ſaid of all the reſt of your New Articles, and Practices: We ſtand our ground. Some of your Novelties we reject as trifles, ſome as ſmaller errors, and ſome as greater: But ſtill we keep to our antient faith, of which the Scripture is a full and ſufficient Rule, (as *Vincentius Lirinenſ. ubi ſupra*;) though we are glad of all helps to underſtand it. We ſay with *Tertullian de carne Chriſti, cap. 6. Nihil de eo conſtat, quia Scriptura non exhibet.* —— *Non probant, quia non Scriptum eſt* —. *His qui inſuper argumentantur nos reſiſtemus.*

CHAP. XXXVII.

Detect. 28. ANother of their Deceits is this. *They make advantage of our charitable judgement of them, and of their uncharitable judgement of us and all other Chriſtians, to affright and entice people to their ſect.* They ſay, that *we cannot be ſaved, nor any that are not of the* Roman *Church*: But *we* ſay, that *a Papiſt may be ſaved.* They ſay, that *we* want abundance of the Articles of faith that are of neceſſity to ſalvation; We ſay, that the Papiſts hold all that is neceſſary to ſalvation. *Luther* ſaith, that the Kernel of true faith is yet in the Church of *Rome*; therefore ſay they, *Let Proteſtants take the ſhell.* And hence they make the ſimple people believe, that even according to our own Confeſſions, their Church and way is ſafer than ours.

I have anſwered this formerly in my *Safe Religion*; but yet ſhall here once more ſhew you the nakedneſs of this Deceit.

1. The Papiſts denying the faith and ſalvation of all

other Christians, doth no whit invalidate our faith, nor shake our salvation. Our Religion doth not cease to be true, when ever a peevish adversary will deny it, or accuse it. Men are in never the more danger of damnation, because a Papist or any other partial Sectary will tell them that they shall be damned. We believe not that the Pope hath so far the Power of the Keyes of Heaven, as that he can keep out whom he please. We have a promise of salvation from Christ, and then we can bear the threatning of a Pope. When *Bellarmine* judgeth Pope *Sixtus* damned himself, it's strange that he should have a power before to dispose of Heaven for others, and shut out whom he pleased, that must be shut out himself. The Novatians, Donatists, Anabaptists, or any such Sect, that held the substance of the Christian faith, might have pleaded this Argument as well as the Papists. For they also have the courage to pass the sentence of damnation upon others, if that will serve turn: and we have the Charity to say, that some of them may be saved.

2. If, by the Papists own confession, Charity be the life of all the graces or holy qualities of the soul, and that which above all others proveth a man to be Justified, and in a state of salvation, then judge by this Argument of their own, whether our charitableness or their uncharitableness be the better sign, and whether it be safer to joyn with the charitable or the uncharitable? yea with them that are so notoriously uncharitable, as to condemn the far greatest part of the Church of Christ meerly because they are not Papists?

3. When we say, that a Papist may be saved, it is with all these limitations. 1. We say, that a Papist as a Christian may be saved, but not as a Papist. As a man that hath the Plague may Live; but not by the Plague. 2. We say, that Popery is a great enemy and hin-

hinderance to mens salvation; and therefore that those among them that are saved, must be saved *from* Popery, and not *by* it. 3. We say, that therefore salvation is a rarer thing among the Papists, than among the Reformed Catholicks. Where it is most difficult, it is like to be most rare. Many more of the Orthodox are like to be saved than of the Papists. 4. And we say, that where Popery prevaileth against Christianity, and so much mastereth the heart and life, that the Christian Doctrine is not Practically received, there is no salvation to be had for such, without Conversion. Thus is it that we say a Papist may be saved. And for my part, I will not be the more uncharitable to them, for fear of giving them advantage. I know *Hunnius* hath written a Book to prove them no Christians, and *Perkins* hath written another to prove, that a Papist cannot go beyond a Reprobate: And I must needs say so too, of all those in whom Popery is predominant practically, and overcometh Christianity. But yet I doubt not, but God hath thousands among them that shall be saved: partly of the common people that are forced to forbear contradicting the Priests, and that understand not, or receive not all the mysteries of their deceit: and partly among the Fryars and Jesuites, where some of them take in the venom but speculatively, or not predominantly, and practically give themselves to Mortification and an holy Life. Though I have known none such, yet when I read the writings of *Gerson*, *Kempis*, *Thaulerus*, *Ferus*, *Barbanson*, *Benedictus Anglus*, the Life of *Monsieur de Renty*, and such others, (though I see in some much of error, and meer affectation, yet) I am easily perswaded to believe, that they had the spirit of God, and that there are many more such among them. But I should be sorry if Holiness were not much more common among

us, and freer from the mixtures of error and affectation.

4. And for our saying, that *they have the Kernel, and so much as is necessary to salvation*, it is true: But it is the same *Kernel* that we hold, and we have it undefiled and unpoysoned; and the Papists mix it with the venom of their Errors. He that hath all things in his meat and drink that I have in mine, may yet make it worse than mine, if he will put dung or poyson in it. When you have all things necessary in a precious Antidote or other Medicine, you may soon marr all, by putting in more than all, as the Papists do.

The plain truth is, The Papists and Reformed Catholicks are both Christians; and Christianity is enough to save them that mar it not, but keep it practically and predominantly: Even as a man that takes poyson, and he that taketh none, are both of them men; and he that takes the poyson may be said to have all the same parts and members as the other, and yet not be so likely to live, as he that lets it alone: And I cannot say but many that take it may recover: and if you ask me *Which be they?* I say, *All those that timely cast it up again, or else whose strength of Nature prevaileth against it and keepeth it from mastering the Heart or vital Powers, shall be recovered and live; but those in whom the poyson prevaileth and is predominant, shall die:* So all those Papists that so receive the Errors of Popery, as either to cast them up again; or that they are not predominant to the subduing of the power of Christian Faith and Holiness, (by keeping them from being sincere, and practical, and predominant,) these shall be saved, but not the rest.

Now if upon these grounds, any man shall think that Popery is the safer way, because we say, that they have all that is necessary to salvation (objectively in their

their Creed,) and that a Papist may be saved; upon the same terms that man may be perswaded that it is safest taking poyson, because that he hath all the parts of a man that takes it, and possibly nature may prevail, and he may live. But yet I shall choose to let it alone.

5. The same Papists that say, that a Protestant cannot be saved, do yet maintain that an Infidel may be saved, or one that believeth not the very Articles of the Christian faith. You will think this strange. But I will a little insist on the proof of it, to these uses, 1. That you may see, that their censures proceed from meer design or partiality. 2. That you may see, that they make believing in the Pope to be more necessary than believing in Christ, or in the Holy Ghost. 3. That you may see, how holy their Church is that admitteth of Infidels. 4. That you may see, on how fair grounds they deny, that we may be one Catholick Church with the Fathers, *Greeks*, *Egyptians*, *Abassines*, *Armenians*, *Waldenses*, &c. because of some differences; when yet they themselves can be one Church with Infidels, or such as deny the Articles of the Creed, or at least believe them not. 5. And that you may see, how well their Religion hangs together, and also how well they are agreed among themselves, even about the essentials of Christianity it self, whether they be of Necessity to salvation or not.

I before cited the words of *Albertinus* the Jesuite. I shall now give you many more, and more fully, which *Franc. à Sancta Clara* hath gathered to my hands in his *Deus*, *Natura*, *Gratia*, *Problem.* 15, & 16, *pag.* 109, &c.

And 1. *pag.* 110, he tells us himself that [*The Doctors commonly teach, that a just and probable ignorance ought to excuse: and that, it is* probable, *when one*

one hath a probable foundation (or ground.) As a Country-man, when he believes that a thing is lawful, drawn by the Testimony of his Parish Priest or Parents: or when a man seeing reasons that are probable on both sides, doth choose those which seem to him the more probable; which yet indeed are against the truth, to which he is otherwise well affected. In this case he erreth without fault, though he err against the truth, and so Labour of the contrary ignorance]. [*Hither is it to be reduced, when the Articles of Faith are not propounded in a due manner; as by frivolous reasons, or by impious men: for then to believe, were an act of imprudence, saith* Aquin. 2. 2. q. 1. ar. 4.]

So that if the truth of Scripture be so propounded as to seem most improbable, it is no sin to disbelieve it: and if such are excused, as by a Parent or Parish-Priest are seduced, and that have not a due proposal of the Truth; then it must follow, that the Heathens and Infidels are innocent, that never had Christ proposed any way to them, and by their Parents have been taught Mahometanism, or Paganism. But what if I can prove, that even the want of a due proposal is a punishment for their sin? and that they ought themselves to seek after the truth? and that it is long of their own sins that necessary truths do seem improbable to them? Will sin excuse sin?

And *pag.* 111, he telleth us, [*That, as to the Ignorance of things necessary as means (to salvation,) the Doctors differ: for* Soto 4. d. 5. q. 5. & l. de natur. & grat. c. 12. *And* Vega *l.* 6. *c.* 20. *sup. Trid. will have no more explicite faith required now in the Law of Grace, than in the Law of Nature. Yea* Vega *loco citato, and* Gab. 2. *d.* 21. *qu.* 2. *art.* 3. *&* 3. *d.* 21. *qu.* 2. *think, that in the Law of Nature, and, in cases, in the Law of Grace, a man may*

may be ſaved with only Natural Knowledge, and that the habit of faith is not required. And Horantius (being of the contrary opinion,) ſaith, that they are men of great name that are againſt him, whoſe gravity and great and painful ſtudies moved him, not to condemn them of hereſie, in a doubtful matter, not yet judged.] (O happy *Rome* that hath a judge that can put an end to all their controverſies! And yet cannot determine whether it be Neceſſary to ſalvation to be a Chriſtian!)

[Yea (ſaith *S. Clara,*) Alvarez *de Auxil. diſp.* 56, with others, ſeems to hold, that to Juſtification is not required the knowledge of a ſupernatural object at all. Others ſay that both to Grace and to Glory an explicite faith in Chriſt is neceſſary, as Bonavent. 3. d. 25, and others. Others ſay, that to ſalvation at leaſt an explicite faith in the Goſpel, or Chriſt is required, though not to Grace or Juſtification. And this is the commoner in the Schools, as Herera declared, and followeth it.]

And for *Scotus*, *S. Clara* ſaith, [I take him to be of that opinion, that it is not neceſſary as a Means to Grace or Glory to have an explicite Belief of Chriſt or the Goſpel, as (4. d. 3. q. 4.) he ſeems at large to prove.]

Pag. 113, he adds, [What is clearer, than that at this day, the Goſpel bindeth not, where it is not authentically preached; that is, that at this day men may be ſaved without an explicite belief of Chriſt: for in that ſence ſpeaks the Doctor concerning the Jews. And verily, what ever my illuſtrious Maſter hold with his Learned Maſter Herera, I think that this was the Opinion of the Doctor (Scotus,) and the common one; which alſo Vega a faithful Scotiſt followeth, and Faber 4. d. 3, Petigianis 3. d. 25. q. 1, and,

of

of the Thomists, Bannes, 22. q. 2. a. 8. *Canus, and others.*]

And he gathers it to be the mind of the Council of *Trent*, Sess. 6. cap. 4. and adds pag. 113, [*It's effectually proved by the Doctor, from* John 15. *If I had not come and spoke to them, they had not had sin. I know the Doctors of the contrary opinion answer, that such are not condemned for the sin of Infidelity precisely, but for other sins that hinder the illumination and special help of God. But verily the Doctor there argueth, that the Jews might by circumcision be cleansed from Original sin, and saved without the Gospel: and accordingly he may argue, as to all others to whom the Gospel is not authentically promulgate: Else his reason would not hold. And our most grave* Corduba l. 2. qu. Theol. q. 5. *subscribes to this opinion, saying* ——— *Since the promulgation of the Gospel, an Explicite Belief of Christ is necessary: except with the invincibly ignorant, to whom an implicite sufficeth to the life of grace: but whether it suffice to the life of glory, is a probleme: but it is more probable that here also an implicite sufficeth.*]

Page 114, he addeth the consent of *Medina de recta in Deum fide, lib. 4. cap. ult. and of* Bradwardine fol. 62, *that an Implicite belief of Christ is sufficient to salvation.*

And *pag.* 115, he saith that [*this is the way to end the debates of them that think the Article of the Trinity, of Christ, of the incarnation,* &c. *are necessary to salvation, though not to Justification:*] and answering them, he saith that [*such are not formally without the Church.*] You see then *formally, Infidels are in their Church, and may be saved*, in his opinion.

And

And *pag.* 116, after a blow at *Velloſillus*, he citeth alſo *Victoria Relect.* 4. *de Indiſ. & Richard. de Med. Villa*, 3. 25. *art.* 3. *qu.* 1, and others for this opinion: And tells you what his Implicite faith is [*to believe as the Church believeth.*]

And *page* 118, he anſwereth, from *Scotus*, the Queſtion, *Whether ſuch perſons may hold the contrary error to the truth that they are ignorant of?* and ſaith, *No*, (out of *Scotus*,) *while it is preached but in ſome one place: till he know it to be believed as a truth by the Church, and then he muſt firmly adhere to it.* Which the charitable Fryar applieth to *England*, as excuſable for not believing ſome of their Articles. And he citeth *Petigianis* ſaying, [*If a ſimple old woman ſhall hear a falſe opinion from a falſe Prophet, (as that the ſubſtance of the bread remains with Chriſts body in the Euchariſt,) and believe it: doth ſhe ſin becauſe of this? No: This were too hard and cruel to affirm.*]

Pag. 119, he citeth *Angles*, and agreeth with him, [*that ſuch as have no knowledge of theſe things to ſtir them up, are not bound ſo much as to ſeek information.*]

And *pag.* 120, he cites *Vega lib.* 6. *cap.* 18, ſaying, that as [*Ignorance* puræ negationis *about many Articles of faith, may be without fault: ſo there is the ſame reaſon of Ignorance* pravæ diſpoſitionis.] Which he maintains againſt *Gerſon* and *Hugo*. And *S. Clara* adds of his own, [*To ſpeak my ſenſe freely, I think that the common people committing themſelves to the inſtruction of the Paſtors, truſting their knowledge and goodneſs; if they be deceived, it ſhall be accounted Invincible Ignorance, or probable at leaſt: ſo* Herera: *which excuſeth from fault. Yea ſome Doctors give ſo much to the Inſtruction of Doctors on whom the care of the flock lyeth, that, if they teach* hic & nunc *that God would*

would be hated, a rude Parishioner is bound to believe them.]

And so *page* 121, concludeth, that he hopeth many of us are saved.

Page 122, he citeth the consent of *Azorius*, *To.* 1. *l.* 8. *just. c.* 6, and *Corduba* again.

And *pag.* 123, saith [*It seemeth to be the common Opinion of the Schools and Doctors at this day, that the Laity, erring with their Teachers or Pastors, are altogether excused from all fault: Yea by erring thus many wayes materially, they merit, for the act of Christian Obedience, which they owe their teachers, as* Valentia *saith*, Tom. 3. disp. 1. q. 2. pag. 5. *and others, with* Angles, Vasquez, *&c.*]

Pag. 124, 125, After *Cajetan*, he cites *Zanchez*, teaching [*that those that are brought up among Hereticks are not bound presently to believe, and yet are not to be accounted Hereticks, till they refuse Belief sufficiently propounded to them*— .] And he cites *Alph. à Castro*, and *Simanchas*, *Aragon*, and *Tannerus*, and *Faber* for the same.

And *pag.* 126, he cites *Eman. Sa*, affirming, that [*even among Catholicks many are excused from the explicite knowledge of the Trinity and Incarnation, specially if there want a Teacher. For what! (saith he,) shall we say that an infinite number of Christians, otherwise good people, perish, that scarce know any thing aright of the Mysterie of the Trinity and Incarnation; yea judge perversly (or falsly) of them, if you ask them?*] And cites *Rozella* and *Medina* of the same mind. Lastly, gives also the Judgement of *Gr. Valentia* fully, *for his opinion*, Analys. fid. lib. 2. cap. 3. lit. D.

In the sixteenth Probleme *page* 127, he puts another Question, *Whether the Law of Nature and Decalogue may be unknown without fault?* And saith, that *though*

Alex.

Alex. Ales *say*, *No:* yet *it is the more common and received Opinion*, (citing *Adrian*, *Corduba*, *Hetera*, & alios communiter,) *that there may be such invincible ignorance in respect of the Law of Nature and the Decalogue.*]

And note, for the understanding of all this, that this which they call an [*Implicite faith in Christ*,] is *no actual faith in Christ at all.* He that only *believes as the Church believes*, and knows not that the Church believes in Christ, in the Resurrection of Christ, *&c.* hath no actual belief in Christ or the Resurrection at all. *Ignoti nulla fides.* If I believe, that one of you is true of his word; it doth not follow, that I actually believe the particular propositions which I never heard. This which they call an implicite Belief, is nothing but the explicite actual belief of the Formal Object of Faith, Divine or Humane; as that God is True, or the Church True and infallible; but it is no belief at all of the particular material object.

And note, that every one in the world that believeth that there is a God, must needs believe that he is no Lyar; and so hath in God an Implicite belief. Now if this will save men, without a particular belief in Christ, then Christianity is not necessary. ☞ Every Turk, and Jew, and Infidel that believeth in God, may then be said to have an Implicite faith in Christ, in the Popish language; because he believeth all that God revealeth to be true: But if an Implicite faith in God will not serve, how should an implicite faith in the Church serve, unless the Church, that is the Pope, be better than God.

See here, whether they make any more of the Christian faith than a meer shooing horn, to draw and keep men to their side. By a General Council and the Pope it is determined that no man can be saved out of their Church;

Church; as headed by the Pope; To believe in the Pope is of Neceſſity to Salvation: But to believe in Chriſt, in his Incarnation, Death, Reſurrection, is not ſo. An Implicite faith in the Pope or Church, yea or erring Doctors may ſave, and men may merit by following them in error: but an Implicite faith in God himſelf will not ſave, if we believe not in the Pope. So that if we were Infidels we might be ſaved, ſo we were of the Church of *Rome*, and believed in the Pope: but the Holieſt Chriſtian that believeth explicitely in God, and all the Articles of faith, cannot be ſaved, if he believe not in the Pope. Do you think they believe theſe Doctrines themſelves? or rather frame them to the building of their Kingdom?

And what a wonder is it that Learned Doctors ſee not their own contradiction? ☞ They ſuppoſe a man to believe in the Pope, or as the Church believeth, and yet not to believe in Chriſt! And is not the Church eſſentially a *company of Chriſtians*; the ſpouſe, and body, and ſchool, and Kingdom of Chriſt? And is not the Pope eſſentially the pretended Vicar of Chriſt, How then can they believe in Chriſts Vicar, or Chriſts School, or Kingdom, or followers, before they believe in Chriſt himſelf?

And by all this you may perceive the Holineſs of the *Roman* Church, and the nature of that Diſcipline or Church-Government that all the world muſt needs ſubmit to, or be damned. Even ſuch as takes in Infidels and all, and layeth the Church as common to the world, for as many as will but believe in the Pope and Clergy.

You ſee here alſo another myſterie opened: that a man may have enough to Juſtifie him, that yet will not ſave him. For moſt of them are here ſaid to hold that a man may be juſtified without an explicite faith in Chriſt,

Christ, or that the knowledge of Christ is not necessary to his Justification, but to his salvation it is: (Though the other half say, that it's necessary to neither.) And if a man die in a Justified State, must he be condemned? When *Paul* saith, *Rom.* 8. 30. *Whom he justified, them he also glorified?*

You see also here what their Baptism doth, that can *ex opere operato* infallibly put away the sins of all these Infidels, and so the Eucharist, *&c.* And yet they must not be saved for all that their sins are all done away. O what a Maze is the Romish Divinity! And you see how well they are agreed about these fundamentals, when half of them think, that *an Actual belief in Christ is necessary to salvation, and not to Justification:* and others, that *it's necessary to both:* and a great part, that *it's necessary to neither.* And you see here the benefit of having an *Infallible Living judge of controversies*, and *expounder of Scriptures:* and how admirably he hath ended all their differences.

And again I say, If formally these *Unbelievers* are in their Catholick Church; they shall give us leave to say, that the Greeks and other Eastern and Southern Christians are in the same Catholick Church as we are, when we differ not so much.

And when they have made the Non-belief of Articles of the faith consistent with salvation, they will never while they breath be able to confute him that on the same grounds affirmeth the contrary belief consistent with salvation, in case of the same want of teaching and sufficient means.

And by this time I hope you see, of how small moment the Popish Censures are, when they judge *that a Protestant cannot be saved.*

It's true that S. *Clara* here judgeth otherwise. But 1. It's said his Book was burnt or condemned at *Rome*

for it. 2. He alloweth Infidels as much. 3. And he proveth himself a Heretick by it at *Rome*, seeing a General Council and Pope have determined the contrary, even that it is necessary to salvation to be a subject of the Pope of *Rome*.

CHAP. XXXVIII.

Detect. 29. ANother of their Deceits, and I think the most successful of all the rest is, *Their suiting their Doctrines and Government and Worship to the fleshly humors of the ungodly: by which means the Greatest and the Most are always like to be on their side.* When, on the contrary, our Doctrine, Dicipline and Worship is all so contrary to carnal interest and conceits, that we are still like to lose the most, if not the greatest, and consequently to be a persecuted people in the world. This is their unanswerable Argument. By this means they captivate the Nations to their Tyranny. The Most are every where almost licentious, sensual, worldly and unsanctified. Wise men and Godly men are few in comparison of the rest of the world. And it is the multitude commonly that hath the strength, and the Great ones that have the wealth. So that I confess I take it for a wonder of mercy, that they are not Lords in every Country, and that the Reformed Catholicks be not used every where as they be in *Spain* and *Italy*. For where they have but opportunity to shew themselves, the Principles and Practices of the Papists are such, as will be most likely to win the Rabble rout to them, and make them Masters of the multitude, and of all except a few believing Heavenly persons: (For the flock is little that must have the Kingdom.) And then, when they have got the multitude

multitude thus to follow them, and clubb'd the rest into prisons, or burned them in the flames, they reckon of this as one of the surest Evidences that they are the Catholick Church; because forsooth *they are the greater number* (in the Countries where they have advantage,) and *it is but a few* whom they were able to persecute or burn as *Hereticks that were against them.* The very Argument of the Jews against Christ and his Disciples.

The Reasons why they have not by this Policie won the Christian world to their side, are (under God, the great Defender of the innocent,) these four; 1. Because in the Eastern and Southern Churches they have not had opportunity to lay their snares, as they have had here in the West: And also those Churches have too many corruptions and neglects at home for the gratifying of the worser sort. 2. Because God hath been pleased in some places so to bless the endeavours of the smaller part, as to enable them against the multitude to preserve some liberty. 3. Because God hath sometime given Wise and Godly Princes to the people, that will not be cheated with the Popular deceits. 4. And principally because that the Papal Tyranny is directly contrary to Princes Rights, so that it's only those that are blinded by ignorance, or strengthned by an extraordinary league with *Rome*, or forced by the multitude of Popish subjects and neighbours, that put their necks into the Romish yoke. For, what by the Popes pretended Power in temporals, at least *in ordine ad spiritualia*; and what by his excommunicating Princes, and his pretended power to depose them, and give their kingdoms to others, and to absolve their subjects from their oaths and fidelity, (which is an Article of their faith, agreed on by the Pope and General Council, *Later. sub Innoc. 3. cap. 3*); and what by his exempting the Clergy from their Princes Power; and what by the pilling their Countries for

mony; and what by their doctrine and practices of murdering Princes that are not of their mind: by these, and many other Evidences, they have awakened many of the Princes of the earth, to look about them, and consequently to befriend the Truth against these Tyrannous Usurpers. Had it not been for these helps under God, we had not been like to have a name where they can reach, nor to have had liberty to breath in the common air.

It would be a voluminous work to shew you how all the Doctrines, Government, and worship of the Papists is suited to the humor of the sensual multitude, and fitted to take with ungodly men. I shall but instance in twenty particulars, (which are far from all;)

1. The Reformed Catholicks hold, that none should be taken into the Church by Baptism, unless themselves, or their Parents, if they be Infants, do make Profession of the Christian faith, and of an holy life, for the time to come, and seem to understand what they say and do, and be serious in it; which exasperateth the grosly ignorant and ungodly, when we deny them this Priviledge of Believers. But the Papists admit of the ignorant ungodly, and such as believe not explicitly in Christ, as you heard even now; and so please the people, and fill their Church.

2. The Orthodox hold, that Baptism giveth Remission of sin to none but true believers and their seed, or those that are their own, whom they have power to dedicate in Infancy to God. The Papists perswade many millions more, that all their sins are not only pardoned, but actually abolished, *ex opere operato*, in their Baptism; which is comfortable News to such ungodly souls.

3. The Protestants say, that Original sin liveth after Baptism in some degree; though it reign not, or condemn not those that are true believers; and that Concupiscence,

piſcence, that is, all inordinacy of the ſenſual appetite, or inordinate inclination to ſenſual objects, is a ſin. The Papiſts tell them that when once they are baptiſed, there is no ſuch thing in them as Original ſin, and that Concupiſcence is no ſin at all.

4. The Orthodox hold, that none are to be admitted to the Euchariſt, and Communion of the Church therein, but thoſe that believe actually (or profeſs ſo to do,) the Articles of the faith, and underſtand the nature of the Sacrament, and live according to the Laws of Chriſt. But the Papiſts give it to all, and drive men to the Sacrament; ſo that *Albaſpinæus* before cited, ſaith, he knows not whether ever any one was kept away in his age.

5. The Proteſtants hold, that men are not to be let alone in ſcandalous ſin; but admoniſhed privately, and then openly before the Church, and if yet they Repent not, and Reform not, to be caſt out; and not to be abſolved or re-admitted, without a Publick Confeſſion and Penitence anſwerable to the ſin: And this wicked people hate at the very heart, and will not endure. But the Papiſts have got a device to pleaſe them, by Auricular ſecret Confeſſion to a Prieſt, where if he will but confeſs and ſin, and ſin and confeſs again, he may have a pardon of courſe without any open ſhame or true Reformation. If we durſt but imitate the Papiſts in this one particular, we ſhould do much to pleaſe the people that are now exaſperated: for I find, that almoſt any of them will confeſs in ſecret that they have ſinned, that will not endure the open ſhame.

6. The Proteſtants hold, that every ſin deſerveth death, and that every breach of the Law is ſuch a ſin; (though God will not inflict the Puniſhment on them that have a pardon.) But the Papiſts tell us of a multitude of ſins that are but venial, that is, ſins that deſerve pardon, and yet deſerve not Hell, and are indeed no ſins, but ana-

logically so called. And they make those to be such venial sins, which Protestants account abominably gross: as, some lying, some swearing in common talk, some drunkenness, some fornication, and the like, are with them but venial sins, which are properly no sins: (And yet here also they are by the ears among themselves, some saying that venial sins are properly sins, and most denying it.) Yea all sins that are not *deliberated* on, are with them but *venial sins*. So that if they will but sufficiently brutifie themselves by suspending the exercise of reason, and will swear, curse, murder, without *deliberation*, they are then free from sin and danger. And how easie and pleasing is this to the ungodly? Those are but Evangelical Counsels with the Papists, that are the Precepts or Laws of Christ to the Protestants.

7. The Protestants teach men, that it is their duty to seek the understanding of the holy Scripture, and to meditate in it day and night. But the Papists do forbid the Common people to read it in a language which they understand, and save them all that labour that Protestants put them on. Nothing can win the people more than cherishing them thus in sloth and ignorance.

8. The Protestants say, that a man cannot be justified or saved without an actual faith in Christ, (or being the Infant of a believer Dedicated to Christ;) and that this faith must extend to all things that are Essential to Christianity. But what the Papists say of the Justification and Salvation of Infidels, if they believe in the Pope, you heard in their own words in the last *Detection*. A comfortable doctrine to the unbelieving world, to whom God hath spoken no such Comfort.

We confess that those that never had the Gospel, are under the Law of nature or works, and under such a Law of Grace as was made to *Adam* and *Noah* in the

the ſubſtance, as to the *Obligation* and the *offers* of it, and that by ſuch a Law they ſhall be judged : But whether any of them perform the conditions of it, or how many, are things that I am not acquainted with. But of the Juſtification of Chriſtians we have clear and certain promiſes.

9. The Proteſtants ſay, that all our beſt works are imperfect, and the ſin that adhereth to them deſerves Gods wrath, according to the Law of works, though he pardon it by the Law of Grace, and that when we have done all we are unprofitable ſervants, and properly Merit nothing of God, for the worth of our works or in Commutative Juſtice. But the Papiſts take thoſe very works to Merit heaven *ex Condigno* ; and (for here they are by the ears again,) ſay ſome of them, *by the Proportion of the work and in Commutative Juſtice*, which the Proteſtants ſay, deſerve damnation for their ſinful imperfections, and therefore need a pardon through the blood of Chriſt. Yea they take [redacted] works to be perfect, and the man to be perfect, and [redacted], that, by ſuch works as theſe, they may Merit for others as well as for themſelves. And how eaſie and pleaſing is this to proud corrupted Nature ?

10. The Proteſtants think, that no Faith Juſtifieth ; but that which is accompanyed with unfeigned Love and Reſolution for Obedience. But the Papiſts make a Faith that's ſeparated from Charity, and joyned with Attrition, to be ſufficient for admiſſion to the Sacrament, which ſhall be inſtead of Love or Contrition, and ſo ſhall put away all ſin.

11. The Proteſtants knowing that God is a Spirit, and will be worſhipped in Spirit and truth, do teach people a ſpiritual way of worſhip, which Carnal men are undiſpoſed to, and unacquainted with. But the Papiſts do accommodate them by a multitude of Ceremonies,

Images, and a Pompous histrionical kind of worship, which is easie and pleasant to flesh and blood. To have an Image before them, and Copes, and Ornaments, and abundance of formalities, and to drop so many Beads, and be saved for saying over so many *Ave Maries*, or such like words; what an easie kind of Religion is this, and how agreeable to flesh and blood? How much easier is it to say over their Offices, than to Love God above all, and desire after Communion with him in the spirit, and to delight in him, and to pray in Faith, and heavenly fervour?

12. Protestants tell men of Hell-fire, as the remediless punishment of those sins, which Papists say deserve but a Purgatory: and they have hopes of coming out of Purgatory, but there's none of coming out of Hell.

13. Protestants tell them of no hope of ease or pardon of sin after this life, if it be not pardoned here. But Papists tell them, that when they are in Purgatory the Pope hath power to pardon them, and the saying of so many Masses for their souls may ease them or rid them out, and the Merits of other folks may deliver them.

14. Protestants tell them, that they must be holy for themselves. But Papists tell them, that they may hire another man to say their prayers for them, which may serve turn.

15. The Protestants do ingenuously confess, that they have no way to end all Controversies in this life: but that we have a sufficient way so far to decide them, as is necessary to the peace of the *soul*, of the *Church*, and of the *Common-wealth*; but no way for a final absolute Decision, till the day of Judgement. The Pastors of the Church are to be Judges, so far as they are to execute: And the Magistrates are to be Judges,

so

ſo far as they muſt execute: And every Chriſtian hath a judgement of Diſcerning, ſo far as he is to execute: But the abſolute final judgement is reſerved to the laſt day, when God will fully end our controverſies. But this ſatisfyeth not men that would have all in hand, and the ſentence paſt before the Aſſizes. And therefore the Papiſts better fit their humour, and tell them (and they do but tell them,) of an End of all their controverſies at hand; of an eaſie cheap remedy by believing the Infallible Pope and Council, and ſo putting an end to all diviſions and doubts.

16. The Proteſtants would have none but ſeeming Profeſſing Saints in their Churches. But the Papiſts Canonize a Saint as a wonder, and ſhut them up in Monaſteries, and call a few [*Religious*] that are ſeparated from other Chriſtians, as Chriſtians formerly were from the World. Which brings the people to think that Holineſs and Religion is not neceſſary to all, but to a few Devotaries that will be better than they are commanded to be.

17. The Proteſtants bind men to keep their vows, and fidelity to their Governours. But the Papiſts tell them that the Pope hath Power to free them from their fidelity, and diſpenſe with their oaths.

18. The Papiſts teach men to faſt: by eating the pleaſanteſt meats. But the Proteſtants uſe a total abſtinence while they faſt, unleſs in meer neceſſity.

19. The main buſineſs and adminiſtration of Proteſtant Paſtors, is againſt that fleſh that is predominant in the unregenerate, and therefore muſt needs be diſtaſteful to the multitude of the ungodly. Our preaching is to open mens ſin and miſery, and cauſe them to perceive their loſt condition, and ſo to reveal

veal to them a crucified Christ, and then to set them on the holy self-denying heavenly life that Christ hath prescribed them: And to speak terrour to the rebellious, and to cast the obstinate out of our communion, and to comfort none as the heirs of Heaven, either in life or death, but only the truly sanctified and renewed souls. But for the Papists, their Preaching in most places is but seldom; but they have a Mass in Latine, and as the old saying is, [*The Mass doth not bite:*] it galleth not a guilty conscience to see a Mass, and hear a many of Prayers which he understandeth not. And when they do preach, when they should shew wicked men their misery, they flatter and deceive them too often by their false doctrine. They cannot humble them in the sense of their Original sin and Misery; for that they tell them was quite extinct and done away in Baptism: and for their following sins, Absolution upon their customary confessions, hath done away all the guilt at least. So that here is no Misery for the Miserable souls to see; but like a Constables presentment at a Sessions, an *Omnia bene:* unless perhaps some gross actual sin be apparent among them, and then they shall have an Oration against it, to drive them to *Auricular confession*, and to receive the Body of Christ and be Absolved. And so do they by Ceremonies and Sacraments *ex opere operato*, quiet the Consciences of unsanctified men, and humour them in all their rites and customs, and at last turn them to Heaven or Purgatory with an Absolution and Extream Unction. And how pleasing a Religion this is to the ungodly people, those Ministers can tell, that see the rage of such against those that deny them even better Forms and Ceremonies, when they desire them to pacifie their Consciences instead of real Holiness and Obedience.

20. Lastly, how the Jesuites have fitted their whole frame

frame of Moral doctrine and Caſe-Divinity to humour the unconſcionable, *Montaltus* the *Janſeniſt* will fully ſhew you, through the whole (fore-cited) *Myſterie of Jeſuitiſm.* Thoſe that would eſcape any worldly trouble or danger, the Jeſuites have a help at hand for, even their doctrine of Equivocation, and Mental reſervation (which makes the Popes Diſpenſation with oaths and promiſes needleſs.) What accommodations they have for him that hath a mind to Murder his adverſary, to calumniate another, to take Uſe without Uſury, to forbear reſtoring ill-gotten goods, to commit fornication, to rob another, and many the like, you may ſee in their own words cited in the ſaid Book. Yea what comfort they have for a man that loveth not God, ſo he will not hate him. Truſt not my report, but read the Book; for it's worth the reading.

So that we ſee the Advantage that the Papiſts have to ſweep away the vicious ignorant multitude, and then to boaſt that they are the Catholicks, and we but Schiſmaticks, becauſe they are the greater part: and then they are armed alſo by the Multitude, to oppreſs us by their violence.

Now what remedy to uſe againſt this *Fraud*, I cannot tell, but only to deal plainly and faithfully, though it do diſpleaſe, and to adminiſter Gods Ordinances as he preſcribeth, though never ſo diſtaſteful to fleſh and blood; and ſo to commit our ſelves to God, and truſt him with his Church and cauſe, who is able to preſerve it, and is moſt engaged to appear for us when we lay all upon him, and have none to truſt but himſelf alone. Let us not hearken in this caſe to fleſh and blood that would adviſe us to remit the reins of Diſcipline, and to bend our Adminiſtrations to ſome pleaſing complyance with carnal minds. We diſengage God when thus we begin to ſhift for our ſelves out of his way. But withall we

we must acquaint those Princes that are faithful by Christ, how much it is their duty in this case to assist us, not by any cruelty to the Papists; (that I desire not;) but only by quieting the ungodly part of our People in a state of Catechumens or Expectants, or a Learning condition fitted to their state; and to restrain such in the mean time as would take advantage of their discontents, to seduce them by pleasing licentious doctrines to their undoing.

CHAP. XXXIX.

Detect. 30. ANother of their frauds is, *by culling out all the harsh, unhandsome passages, or mistakes that they meet with in any Protestant Writers, and charging all these upon the Protestant Religion; as if they were so many Articles of our Faith, or at least were the common doctrines of our Churches.*

They will not give us leave to do so by them, when yet we have much more reason for it. For 1. They teach the People, that *they are bound to believe as their Teachers bid them:* and they reproach us for confessing, that we are not in all points of Doctrine infallible. And yet we still confess this fallibility, and say in plain terms, that we know but in part. 2. Divers of their particular Doctors that we use to cite, are such as the *Pope hath Canonized for Saints:* and they tell us that in Canonizing he is infallible. And therefore an Infallibly Canonized Saint must not be supposed to err in a point of faith. 3. They boast so much of Unity and Consent among themselves, that we may the better cite particular Doctors. And yet we think our selves bound to stand to their own Law in this, and to charge nothing on them as the faith of their Church but what their

their Church doth own. And therefore while they refuse to stand to *particular Doctors*, we will not urge them to it: for it's good reason that all men should be the Professors of their own belief.

But what reason is there then that we may not have the same measure from them which they expect? We profess to take no man, nor Council of men, for the Lords of our faith, but for the *Helpers* of our faith. They tell us, that they know not where to find our Religion. We tell them it is *entirely in the written word of God*, and that we know no other Infallible Rule; because we know no other Divine Revelation, (supposing what in Nature is revealed.) They tell us that, *All Hereticks do pretend to Scripture, and therefore this cannot be the Test of our Religion?* I answer, that so all cavillers, and defrauders and extortioners, may pretend to the Law of the Land, to undo poor men by quirks of wit, or tire them with vexatious suits: And yet it follows not that we must seek another Rule of Right, and take the Law for insufficient. And what if Hereticks pretend to Tradition, to General Councils, and the Decretals of the Popes, (as you know how frequently they do,) Will you yield therefore that these are an insufficient Rule, or Test of your own Religon? Open your eyes, and judge as you would be judged.

But I will come to some of the particular Opinions which they charge us with. And because I know not a more weighty renowned Champion of their cause than *Cardinal Richlieu* (then Bishop of *Lucion:*) I shall take notice of his twelve great errours, which he so vehemently chargeth on the Reformed Churches, as contrary to the Scripture. And sure I shall do much to make clean our Churches, if I fully wipe off all the pretended blots of errour, that so wise a man could charge

charge upon them. In his *Defens. contra script. 4. Minist. Charenton. cap. 2. pag.* 12, &c. he begins his enumeration thus.

1. [*The Scripture saith*, Jam. 2, *that a man is not Justified by Faith only: But you say, that he is Justified by Faith alone, and by Faith only, which is found in no place of Scripture: and do you not then resist the Scriptures?*]

Answ. 1. We believe both the words of *Paul* and *James*, that a *man is Justified by Faith without the Deeds of the Law, and saved through Faith,* ——— *not of works, lest any man should boast*, Rom. 3. 28. Ephes. 2. 8, 9. and also that *a man is Justified by works, and not by Faith only*, Jam. 2. Did not this Learned man know that we believe all the Bible? Why then should he charge us with denying that, which we retain and publickly read in our Churches as the word of God? Did he think that we set so much by *Luthers*, or any mans writings, as by the Bible? 2. But if he can prove that we understand not these words aright, he should have evinced it better than by the use of the words [*Faith alone*;] For our Churches by [*Faith alone*] do profess openly to mean no more than *Paul* doth by [*Faith without works:*] And can they find fault with *Paul?* 3. Indeed we are not all agreed upon the fittest Notion of the interest of Faith and works in our Justification: but our difference is more in words and notions than matter, of which see my *Disput. of Justification.* 4. And why do you not quarrel with your own Cardinal *Contarenus de Justif.* and others of your own, that joyn with us in the doctrine of Justification?

2. His second Accusation is, [*The Scripture saith, that we can Love God with all the heart: You say, that no man can Love God with all the heart, which is no*

where

where read in Scripture : and yet do you not reſiſt the Scriptures ?

Anſw. 1. Unprofitable Confuſion ! We diſtinguiſh between *Loving God with all the Heart*, as it ſignifieth the *ſincerity and predominant degree of Love*, and ſo every true Chriſtian hath it : and as it ſignifieth ſome *extraordinary degree above this meer ſincerity*, and ſo ſome eminent ſtronger Chriſtians have it : and as it ſignifieth the *higheſt Degree*, *which is our duty*, *and which excludeth all ſinful imperfection*, and thus we ſay, that no man actually doth Love God perfectly in this life ; nor do we think he ſpeaks like a Chriſtian, that dare ſay, *Lord I Love thee ſo much*, *that I will not be beholden to thee to forgive the imperfection of my Love*, *or to help me againſt any ſinful imperfection of it.* Your own Followers whom you admire as the higheſt Lovers of God, do oft lament the imperfections of their Love, (as *M. de Renty*, for inſtance, in his Life.) But now, if the queſtion be only of the *poſſe* and not the *act* ; we ſay, that the *Potentia Naturalis* is in all, and the *Potentia Moralis*, which is the Habit, is in the ſanctified : but this *Moral Power* is not *perfect* it ſelf, that is, of the higheſt degree, and without any ſinful imperfection, though yet it hath the perfection of ſincerity, and, in ſome, the perfection of an eminent degree. And will not this content you?

His third Accuſation is, [*The Scripture ſaith*, *that the Euchariſt is the Body and Blood of Chriſt*, *with the adjunction of thoſe words that ſignifie a true Body and Blood : You ſay that it is not Chriſts Body and Blood*, *but only a figure*, *ſign*, *and teſtimony*, *which the Scripture no where ſaith.*]

Anſw. 1. The Scripture ſaith not, that it is his Body and Blood *ſubſtantially*, or by *Tranſubſtantiation :* And we ſay not, as you feign, that it is *not his Body and Blood*,

Blood, but a figure, &c. For we say, that *it is his Body and Blood Sacramentally and Representatively*; as he that personateth a King on some just account, is called a King: and as in actions of Investiture and Delivery, the delivering of a Key is the delivering of the House, and the delivery of a twig and turf is the delivery of the Land, and the deliverer may say, *Take, this is my House, this is my Land, which I deliver thee.* If you be among many Images in a room, you will not blame him that saith, *This is* Peter, *and this is* Paul, *and this is the Virgin* Mary. 2. The Scripture often calls it *Bread* after the Consecration; which you condemn us for: therefore we are taught to call it so. 3. The Scripture saith, [1 *Cor.* 10. 4, *That Rock was Christ:*] and he saith, [*I am the door*, John 10. 7. *I am the true Vine*, John 15. 1.] *David* saith, [*I am a worm and no man*, Psal. 22. 6.] We believe all this. But must we be therefore reproached, if we say, that *David was a man*; that the Rock was Christ typically; that he was a Vine and Door Metaphorically only? And yet these are as plain as *This is my Body*, and *This is my Blood.*

His fourth Accusation is, [*The Scripture saith, that Baptism saveth us, and that we are cleansed and regenerate by the washing of water: On the contrary you say, that Baptism doth neither save us, nor regenerate us, but is only to us a symbol of salvation, ablution, and regeneration, which is no where said in Scripture.*]

Answ. A childish contest about words! We say, that two things go to our full possession of our state of Regeneration, Justification, and Cleansing: One is *our fundamental Right*, which the *Promise* of the Gospel gives us upon our *Heart-consent* or Covenant with God: The other is our *Solemn Investiture.* In regard of the former, we are Christians, and Regenerate, and Justified,

Juſtified, before Baptiſm: In regard of the later, we are made Chriſtians, regenerate, juſtified, ſaved, by Baptiſm. This we commonly hold, and ſo never denyed what you falſly ſay we deny. As a man is made a King by his Coronation, that yet in a ſort was one before: or as Marriage makes them Husband and Wife by publick ſolemnization, that were fundamentally ſo before by Private Covenant: or as poſſeſſion is given by a Key, a twig and a turf (as I ſaid) of that which a man had right to before; ſo are we ſolemnly inveſted with thoſe benefits by baptiſm, which we had a fundamental Title to before. Do not your own writers confeſs this of a man that is Baptized many years after he had Faith and Charity? Do you think *Cornelius* and the reſt that had the Holy Ghoſt before Baptiſm, *Act.* 10, had not Juſtification before? Do you think that *Conſtantine* the Great was unpardoned, unregenerate and no Chriſtian till he was Baptized? Or rather would you make quarrels againſt your own Confeſſions?

His fifth Accuſation is, [*Scripture ſaith, that Prieſts do forgive ſin: On the contrary you ſay that they do not remit them, but only teſtifie that they are remitted, which the Scriptures no where ſay.*]

Anſw. As if *Teſtification* could not be a *Remiſſion*. We ſay, that *whoſe ſins* the Paſtors of the Church *remit, they are remitted*. Do you not know that theſe very words were uſed to every Presbyter in our Ordination here in *England*? We ſay 1. That Paſtors do as Gods Embaſſadors, proclaim his General Conditional Pardon unto all. 2. That they are Gods Miniſters to make a particular Application, and delivery of pardon in Baptiſm; on ſuppoſition that the Baptized be qualified for pardon. 3. That they are, as his Miniſters, to make the ſame Application by Declaration and Delivery in the *Abſolution of the Penitent*; on ſuppoſition that

their *penitence* be ſincere. 4. And as Church Governours, they may, on good conſiderations, ſometimes, remit ſome humbling diſgraceful acts, that were impoſed on the penitent for the teſtification of his repentance, and the ſatisfaction of the Church. And are not theſe four conceſſions enough? Or are you minded to pick quarrels, that your ſelves and others may have fewel for the rancour and uncharitableneſs of your minds?

But indeed we do not think that any man can primarily as the chief Agent forgive ſins: but God muſt be the firſt pardoner. Nor that any man can pardon the ſins of the dead, and abate or ſhorten the pains of the ſoul, in a fire called Purgatory. Here we leave you.

And verily, if the Pope have power to remit but the very temporal puniſhment, he is a cruel wretch that will not forgive men, even good men, the torments of the Gout, and the Stone, and an hundred diſeaſes; nay that will not remit them to himſelf, no nor the pains of death, when he is ſo loath to die: (But I forgot that the Pope hath no body to forgive him, becauſe none above him.) He that cannot remit the puniſhments which we ſee, and feel, how ſhall we believe him (without any Divine Teſtimony,) that he can remit a penalty that he never ſaw nor felt, nor no man elſe, that can be proved?

His ſixth Accuſation is [*Scripture ſaith, If a Virgin marry ſhe ſinneth not: But you ſay that the juſt ſin in all works: which Scripture mentions not.*]

Anſw. 1. Do you believe in your Conſcience that the Scripture meaneth that a Virgin ſinneth not at all in any circumſtance or defect in the manner or Concomitants of her Marriage? Then I pray tell your *Nuns* ſo, that if *they marry they ſin not.* Tell Prieſts ſo, that if *they marry they ſin not.* Your own reaſon can expect no other ſenſe in the words, but that *Marriage,*

as

as such, is no sin to the Virgin. And this we grant. But yet if you think that in this or in any other work, you see God as apprehensively, and believe as strongly, and restrain every wandring thought as exactly, and Love God as much as you are bound to do by the very Law of Nature it self; so that you are perfectly blameless, and need not be beholden to the blood of Christ, to the Mercy of God, to the Spirit of Grace, either for the forgiveness of these failings, or the cure of them: you shew then a proud Pharisaical spirit, unacquainted with it self and with the Gospel. Do you go on and say, *Lord I thank thee that I am not as other men:* and I will rather say, *Lord be merciful to me a sinner:* and which shall be rather justified, Christ hath told us. The streams cannot be perfectly sinless, till the fountain be so: and [*Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?* Prov. 20. 9.] [*For there is not a just man upon earth, that doth good, and sinneth not,* Eccl. 7. 20.] Christ telleth us that the fruit will be like the Tree, the actions like the heart: and therefore an imperfect Heart will have imperfect duties. If you dare say there is no remnant of sin in your hearts, you have so much of it that it hindereth you from seeing it. Humility and self-knowledge would soon end this controversie. We say not that all our works are sins, that is, either *materially forbidden*, or *done in wickedness* and from vitious predominant habits: But that the same works, which *Materially are good*, are tainted with our sinful imperfections, having not in them that measure of knowledge, faith, love, *&c.* as we ought to have; and therefore that we must beg pardon for our imperfections, and fly to the blood and merits of Christ, through whom God will accept both our works and us, for all the imperfections, which he pardoneth to us of his grace.

His seventh Accusation is [*Scripture saith, that there are wicked men and reprobates, that believe in Christ: But you contend that they believe not, but have only a shadow of faith: which no Scripture saith.*]

Answ. Again, a quarrel about the name of faith, unworthy serious men! We say that Reprobates do believe, and we say that they believe not, taking belief in different senses. We believe whatever the Scripture saith, even that the Devils believe and tremble: and yet as Believers and Christians are all one, we are loth to call the Devils Believers and Christians; but you may do it, if you please. As *Belief* signifieth a bare uneffectual conviction or superficial Assent which you call *fides informis*, so we still confess that the wicked may believe. But as *Belief* signifieth our *Receiving of Christ*, and *Coming to him*, and *being planted into him as his members*, and *taking him heartily as Christ, our Lord and Saviour*, and so *becoming Christians and Disciples*; as it signifieth such a faith that hath the promise of pardon of sin, of Adoption, and of Glory: So we say that the wicked have but a shew or shadow of it. And this is the sense of the words of *Calvin*, *P. Martyr*, *Beza*, and *Daneus*, whom you cite. And do you not think so your selves? Indeed you know not what to believe in this, as I have shewed in the *Postscript* to my *Disput. of Sacraments*.

His eighth Accusation is this, [*Scripture saith, that there are some that believe for a time, and after at another time believe not: You deny that there are any that believe for a time, and then fall from faith, and that he that once believeth doth never lose that faith; which is not in any Scripture to be found.*]

Answ. It is too light in serious matters, to play thus upon words. 1. We still maintain, that there are some that believe but for a time, and afterward fall away: but

but we say it is but with an uneffectual or common assent that they believe, such as you call *fides informis*: Your accusation therefore is false. The *semen vitæ* and faith, that *Calvin* speaks of in the place which you cite, is meant only of a saving faith, such as you call *fides charitate formata*. If any of you think that faith is called *charitate formata*, or justifying or saving faith, only by an extrinsecal denomination, from a concomitant, and that there is no difference in the faith it self between that of the unjustified and of the justified, you are mistaken against all reason. Your own Philosophers frequently maintain that the will (which is the seat of charity,) followeth the practical dictates of the Intellect (which is the seat of Assent:) And therefore according to those Philosophers, a Practical Belief must needs be accompanyed with charity. And those that deny this, do yet maintain that a powerful clear Assent of the Intellect will infallibly procure the determination of the Will, though every assent will not, and though it do it not Necessarily. So that on that account (and in common reason) there must needs be an intrinsick difference between that Assent which prevaileth with the will to determine it self, and that which cannot so prevail: And therefore your unformed and your formed faith, have some intrinsick difference.

2. The *Lutherans*, that are half the Protestants, do think that justifying faith may be lost. So that (be it right or wrong) you cannot charge this on them all.

3. The rest which be not of their mind, do hold a brotherly communion with them; and therefore take not that point to be of so much moment as to break communion.

4. Are you not at odds among your selves about perseverance? Some laying it first on mans free will; and some, with *Austin*, ascertaining perseverance to the

Elect, becauſe Elect, and laying it on Gods free Gift; and ſome Jeſuites and School men affirming, that the confirmed in Grace are not only certain to perſevere, but that they neceſſarily believe and are ſaved, and cannot mortally ſin; (Strange doctrine for a Jeſuite!) Of all this controverſie of perſeverance, I deſire the Reader to ſee a few ſheets called *An Account of my Judgement* hereabout. When I wrote thoſe, I knew not whom *Alvarez* meant (*lib.* 10. *Diſp.* 104. *pag.* 419. §. 1. *de Auxil.*) when he diſputed againſt this ſort of men: But ſince I find it in his *Reſponſ. ad Object. Lib.* 2. *cap.* 9. *pag.* 522, *&c.* where he tells us, that it is the Jeſuite *Greg. de Valentia, Tom.* 2. *diſp.* 8. *q.* 3. *punct.* 4. *ſ.* 2. and *Tom.* 1. *d.* 1. *q.* 23. *punct.* 4. *ſ.* 7. *Ubi docet non ſolum eſſe prælectos ut ſalventur, ſed ut neceſſario ſalventur; ac per conſequens non poſſe peccare Mortaliter, & Neceſſario perſeverare in gratia, ac eatenus non libere, ſed neceſſario ſalvari:* and alſo that he meant *Alexand. Aleſ.* 3. *p. q.* 9. *Et Almain. in* 3. *d.* 11. *q.* 2. *Qui aſſerunt confirmatos in Gratia non habere libertatem,* &c. *Quam ſententiam Medina impugnat.* 3. *p. q.* 27. *art.* 4.

This is more than Proteſtants ſay, And yet will you quarrel?

His ninth Accuſation is this, [*Scripture ſaith, If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments: You ſay that there is no need of keeping the Commandments, and that he that ſaith it, doth deny Chriſt and aboliſh faith, of which the Scripture ſpeaketh not a word.*]

Anſw. Still confuſion playes your game, and you ſtrive about words. We diſtinguiſh between the *keeping of that Law of Works, or Nature, which made perfect obedience the only condition of Life:* and the keeping of *the Law of* Moſes *as ſuch:* and the keeping of the *Law of Chriſt.* For the two firſt, we ſay that no man

man can be justified by the works of the Law. Is this a doubt among Papists, that believe *Pauls* Epistles? But as for the *Law of Christ*, *as such*, we must *endeavour* to keep it *perfectly*, (that's necessary *necessitate præcepti*;) and must *needs* keep it sincerely (*necessitate medii*,) if we will be saved. This all Protestants that ever I spake with are agreed in: And dare any Papist deny it? If we be not all (nor you neither) agreed on the sense of that text of Scripture, yet are we agreed on the doctrine, and yet you quarrel.

His tenth Accusation is, [*Scripture saith, that some that were illuminated and made partakers of the Holy Ghost, did fall, and crucifie again to themselves the Son of God: But you defend, that whoever is once partaker of the Holy Ghost, cannot fall from his Grace: which Scripture speaketh not.*]

Answ. The same again: and a meer untruth! We still maintain that those words of Scripture are of certain truth. But we distinguish between the common and the special gifts of the Spirit. The common gifts may be lost: we never denyed it: The special gifts that accompany salvation, some of us judge are never lost: others of us think are lost only by those that are not predestinate, as *Austin* thought, and your Dominicans think. And what cause is here of your quarrel?

His eleventh Accusation is this, [*Scripture saith, that God taketh away, and blotteth out our iniquity as a cloud, and puts our iniquities far from us, as the East is from the West, and maketh us as white as snow: You say, that he takes not away, nor blotteth out our sin, but only doth not impute it, and doth not make us white as snow, but leaveth in us the fault and uncleanness of sin: which Scripture no where speaks.*]

Answ. This is half *falſhood*, and half *confuſion*, raked up to make a matter of quarrel with. 1. It's *falſe* that we ſay, *He doth not take away, nor blot out our ſin, nor make us white as ſnow.* Do not all Proteſtants in the world affirm all this? 2. There are theſe things here conſiderable. 1. The Act of ſin. 2. The Habit. 3. The guilt, or obligation to puniſhment. 4. The culpability, or *reatus culpæ*. 1. As for the *act*, how can you for ſhame ſay, that God takes it away, when it is a *tranſient act* that is gone of it ſelf as ſoon as acted, and hath no exiſtence, as *Scotus* and all your own take notice? 2. As to the *Culpability*, you will not ſure for ſhame ſay, that God ſo put away, *e. g. David*'s Adultery, as to make it *reputable as a vertue, or not a vice.* 3. As to the *Reatus ad pœnam*, the full Guilt, we maintain that it is *done quite away:* and if your eyes be in your head, you may ſee that it is in regard of this guilt and puniſhment that the Scriptures mentioned by you ſpeak (or principally ſpeak at leaſt.) For I ſpray you tell us, what elſe can they mean, when they ſpeak of actual ſins that are paſt long ago, and have no exiſtence? Learned wranglers! Would you make us believe, that Grace is given to *David* to put away the Act of his Murder and Adultery ſo, that it may be *quid præteritum, & non jam exiſtens?* a thing paſt and gone; which it is without grace? So that when you feign us to ſay, that *God takes not away ſin, but only not imputeth it*, you feign us to make ſynonymal terms to be of different ſences. He takes them away, by not imputing them.

4. But if you ſpeak not of the ſence of a particular Text, but of the *Matter* in difference, it can be nothing but the *habit* of ſin that you mean, that we ſay, that *God takes not away.* And here you play partly the Calumniators, and partly the erroneous Phariſees. 1. You Calumniate,

Calumniate, in feigning us to deny, that *habitual sin is done away.* Because our Divines say, that it is not the work of meer pardon (which we call Justification,) to put it away; therefore you falsly say, that we hold, it is not put away at all. Whereas we hold (without one contradicting vote that ever I read or heard,) that all that are *Justified*, are *Sanctified, Converted, Regenerate, Renewed*, and *must live an holy life*: and that all their sins are so far destroyed, that they shall not have dominion over them: that Gross and Wilful sin they forsake: and the least infirmities, they groan, and pray, and strive against to the last: and then obtain a perfect conquest. 2. But if you mean, that no *degree of habitual or dispositive sin*, or *absence of holy qualities remaineth* in the Justified soul, it is a Pharisaical errour, yea worse than a Pharisee durst have owned. And it seems this is your meaning, by the words of *Calvin's* which you cite. And dare you say that you have no sin to resist, or purge, or pardon? Are you in Heaven already? The whole have no need of the Physitian, but the sick? and have you no need of Christ to heal your soul? Would you be no better than you are? O proud souls! and strange to themselves and the purity of the Law! Hath not the Holy Ghost pronounced him a Lyar and Self-deceiver, that saith he hath no sin, 1 Joh. 1. 8, 10? *In many things we offend all*, Jam. 3. 2. I shall but recite to you two Canons of a Council, which, if you use the Lords prayer, are fit for you to consider. *Concil. Milevit. cont. Pelagianos Can.* 7. [*Item placuit, ut quicunque dixerit, in Oratione Dominica ideo dicere sanctos, Dimitte nobis Debita nostra, ut non pro seipsis hoc dicant, quia non eis jam necessaria ista, sed pro aliis, qui sunt in suo populo peccatores; & ideo non dicere unumquemque sanctorum, Dimitte mihi debita mea, sed Dimitte nobis debita nostra, ut hoc pro*

aliis

aliis potius quam pro se Justus petere intelligatur, Anathema sit.

Can. 8. *Item placuit, ut quicunque verba ipsa Dominicæ Orationis, ubi dicimus, Dimitte nobis debita nostra, ista volunt à Sanctis dici, ut humiliter, non veraciter hoc dicatur, Anathema sit. Quis enim ferat Orantem, & non hominibus, sed ipsi Domino mentientem, qui Labiis sibi dicit dimitti velle, & Corde dicit, quæ sibi dimittantur debita non habere?*]

You see here the Council curseth all those as intolerable Lyars, that say the Lords prayer, desiring him daily to forgive or remit their sins, and yet think that they have no sins to forgive, yea or that every Saint hath not such sins. What can a Papist say to this, but by making Councils as void of sence, as they feign the holy Scriptures to be?

His twelfth and last Accusation is this, [*The Scripture saith, that Blessedness is the Reward, the Prize, the Penny, the wages of Labourers, and the Crown of Righteousness: You contend that its meerly the free gift of God, and not a Reward, which no Scripture doth affirm.*]

Answ. A meer Calumny, and perverting of *Calvin's* words, who often saith, as we constantly do, that *Eternal life is given as a Reward and Crown of Righteousness.* But we distinguish between the *Act of God* in his *Gospel Promise*, which is a Conditional Deed of Gift of Christ and Life to all that will Accept them, and the *execution* of this by Judgement and Glorification. And we say that it was, *Antecedenter, meerly of Gods free Grace* that he *made such a Deed of Gift* (the blood of Christ being the purchasing cause,) and nothing of our works had a hand in the procurement: (Dare you deny this?) But that our *Justification in Judgement*, and our *Glorification*, which are the *Execution* of the Law

of

of Grace, do make our works the Reason, not as having merited it *ex proportione operis*, or in *Commutative Justice*, but as having performed the condition of the free Gift, and so being the persons to whom it doth belong. And this is the sense of *Scotus* and of one half of the Papists, (for still you are together by the ears,) who say that *Merit of Condignity* is but *ex pacto* by virtue of Gods Promise.

And now I leave it to the Conscience of any sober Papist, whether we be guilty in any one point that this great Cardinal chargeth us with? And whether Papists and Protestants were not in a fair way for reconciliation, if we differed not more in other things than in these?

And here again I must let them know, that Scripture only is the Rule and Test of our Faith and Religion. Their *Polydor Virgil*, in this, speaks truly of us, saying [*They are called Evangelical, because they maintain that no Law is to be received in matters of salvation, but what is delivered by Christ or his Apostles:*] (so sapless and putid is their scorn of the *Evangelium quintum.*) If therefore *Luther*, *Calvin*, or any man speak in any word amiss, blame the man that spoke it for that word; but blame not all, or any others for it, if you are men. *Austin* Retracted his own errours; and which of us dare Justifie every word that hath faln from our mouths or pen, before God? How many hundred points do Schoolmen and Commentators charge on one another as Erroneous, among your selves? Shall all the errours of the Fathers be charged on the Catholick Church, or all your writers errours upon yours?

And that we do well to stick to the Holy Scriptures as the sufficient Rule, we are the more encouraged to think, by the concessions of our adversaries of greatest Note, (as well as by the Testimony of the Scripture it self,

ſelf, and the concent of the ancient Doctors of the Church, and the unprovedneſs of their pretended additionals.) Among others even this great Cardinal *Richlieu* ſaith thus, *pag.* 38, [*Nos autem nullam aliam*, &c. i. e. *As for us, we put (or aſſert) no other Rule but Scripture, neither of another ſort, nor total.* ☞ *Yea we ſay that it is the Whole Rule of our Salvation, and that on a double account: both becauſe it containeth immediatly and formally the ſumm of our ſalvation, that is, all the Articles that are neceſſary to mans ſalvation, by neceſſity of means* (N. B.); *and becauſe it mediately containeth whatſoever we are bound to believe, as it ſends us to the Church to be inſtructed by her, of whoſe infallibility it certainly confirmeth us.*]

Note here that 1. He grants us that all Articles neceſſary to our Salvation, as Means, are immediately and formally in the Scripture: And then ſurely they may be ſaved that believe no more than is in the Scripture: 2. That we are to believe no Church but that which the Scripture ſends us to, and to believe its infallibility no further than the Scripture doth confirm it. And that the Scripture is our whole and only Rule. O that all Papiſts would ſtand to this! But let them not blame us now for ſtanding to it. Had this Cardinal done no more by Policy and Power than by Diſputing againſt the Reformation, he might eaſily have been dealt with.

CHAP.

CHAP. XL.

Detect. 31. ANother of their frauds is, *By ranking the Proteſtants among the rabble of Sects and Hereſies that are in the world, and then asking ignorant ſouls, If you will needs be of any ſect, how many are here before you? and what reaſon have you rather to be of the Proteſtants, than of any other.*

Anſw. Indeed this queſtion is worth the conſidering by a Papiſt, or any ſectary; but the true Catholick is quite out of the reach of it. The Church of Chriſt is One, and but One. This one Catholick Church containeth all the true Chriſtians in the world. This is the Church that I am a member of, which is far wider than the Roman Church. The Church that I profeſs my ſelf a member of, containeth three parts; 1. *The moſt ſound and healthful part*; and that is the *Reformed Churches*. 2. *The moſt unſound in doctrine*, though poſſeſt of many Learned men; and that is the *Papiſts themſelves: (not as Papiſts* ſimply, but *as Chriſtians*, though infected with Popery.) 3. The *middle part*, which is ſounder than the Papiſts in doctrine, but leſs learned, and below the Proteſtants in both; and that is all the *Greeks* and *other Eaſtern* and *Southern Churches* that are no ſubjects of the Pope. All theſe, even all true Chriſtians, are members of the Church that I belong to; though ſome of them be more ſound, and ſome be leprous, or lamentably polluted. To theſe I may add many particular leſſer ſects, that ſubvert not the foundation, as ſome Anabaptiſts, and divers others. And will you ask me now why I will not be of another ſect, as well as of the Proteſtants? Why, my anſwer is ready, A Sect divided from the body, I abhor: I am of no Sect; It is the Unity,

Univerſality

Universality and Antiquity of the Church that are its honourable attributes in my eyes. Protestants that unchurch all the rest of the world, and count themselves the whole Church of Christ, do in some sort make themselves a Sect. But where is there any such? I know none such, nor I hope ever shall do. And therefore I may say that Protestants are no more a sect, than the Patients in an Hospital that are almost healed, or than the higher form of Scholars in a school, or than the Merchants or richer sort of Tradesmen in a City. And such a Sect God grant that I may be of, even one in the Church that shall be of soundest understanding, and of purest worship, and of the most careful, holy, honest life. But still I shall acknowledge them of the lowest form, even them that learn the A. B. C. to be in the same School with me. And if they, (Papists or any others,) will disclaim me, that shall not unchurch me, as long as Christ disclaims me not. Nor shall it provoke me to disclaim them any further than I see Christ leading me the way. So that the Papists may see that if they will deny the Church that I am of, they must deny their own, and all the Christian world.

But how will they answer this themselves? Seriously I profess, that besides their other errours, it is one of the greatest reasons why I dare not be a Papist, because then I know I must be a Sectary. What is a Papist but as meer a sectary as any that retaineth a name in the Church? They are a company of men that have set up a Humane Usurping Head or Vice-christ over the Catholick Church, owning him themselves, and unchurching and condemning all the Church that will not own him. The Church that I am of is near thrice as big as the Papists Church is. Theirs is but a piece, and a polluted piece, that would divide it self from all the rest by condemning them.

And

And now I would seriously desire any Papist living to resolve the question, If he will needs be of a sect, and forsake the Universal Church, why of the Popish sect rather than another? If because it is the greatest, I answer, it's less than the whole. If because it is the purest, it is one of the most impure. If for Antiquity, it is founded (as Papal) upon Novelty. If because it is the Richest? their money perish with them that measure the Church and truth of Christ by the Riches and splendour of this world. For my part I cannot help you out of this snare.

CHAP. XLI.

Detect. 32. ANother of their juglings is, *By working upon the peoples natural affections, and asking them, Where they think all their fore-fathers are that dyed in the communion of the Roman Church? Dare they think they are all damned?* intimating that it's cruelty to say their ancestors are in Hell; and if they say they be in Heaven, then there is but one way thither, and therefore you must go the way that they went.

But a weak understanding may easily deal with this kind of Sophistry, if it be not mastered by affection. For 1. What if we grant that many of our fore-fathers that dyed Papists are in Heaven? Doth it follow that we must therefore be Papists? No: because it was not by Popery that they came to Heaven, but by Christianity. What if many recover and live that eat not only Earth and Dirt, but Hemlock or Spear-wort, or other poysons? Must I therefore eat them? Or doth it follow that there is no other way to health?

2. Our

2. Our fore-fathers were all saved that were holy, justified persons, and no others. But among so many and great impediments as Popery cast in their way, we have great reason to fear that far fewer of them were saved, than are now among the Reformed Churches. And must I needs go that difficult way to Heaven, because that some of them get thither? Must I needs travail a way that is commonly beset with thieves, because some that go that way do scape them? This is our case.

3. If this were a good way of Reasoning, then may all the Heathens, Infidels, Mahometans, use it, that have been educated in darkness. And indeed it is the Argument which the barbarous Heathens use, when the Gospel is preached to them; [*What think you*, say they, *is become of our fathers? If they were saved without the Gospel, so may we.*] The story of that Infidel Prince is common, that being ready to go to the water to be baptized, stept back, and asked, *Where are all my Ancestors now?* And when he was told that they were in Hell, and that the Christians go to Heaven, he told them, then he would be no Christian, for he would go where his Ancestors are.

4. If this be good reasoning, then we may use it much more than you. For we would ask you, where be all our fore-fathers that are dead since the Reformation? And where be all those that dyed between the Resurrection of Christ and the appearing of Popery, or the prevailing of it in the world? And where be all that die in the Eastern and Southern Churches, that are no subjects of the Pope of *Rome*? Have we not as little reason to think that all these millions of men are damned, as to think so of our Popish Ancestors?

5. Why

5. Why ſhould we be more fooliſh for our ſouls than for our bodies? I would not be poor becauſe my Anceſtors were ſo. Nor would I have the Stone or Gout becauſe my Anceſtors had them. Nor will I ſay that they are no diſeaſes, for fear of diſhonouring my Anceſtors that had them. And why then ſhould I wilfully lick up any Popiſh errours, becauſe my Anceſtors by the diſadvantage of the times and of their education were caſt upon them.

6. It is not our fore-fathers but God that we muſt follow. It is he, and not they, that is the Lord of our faith and of our ſouls. It will not excuſe us in judgement for diſobeying God, to ſay that our fore-fathers led us the way: Nor will it eaſe us in Hell to ſuffer with our fore-fathers. Chriſt tells us, *Luke* 16, of a Rich man that in Hell would have had his brethren warned, leſt they ſhould follow him: But theſe men would have us to follow our fore-fathers, even in their ſin againſt God. Whereas the Scriptures conſtantly make it an aggravation of a peoples ſin, when they follow their fathers in it, and take not warning by their falls. The *Jewiſh* Chriſtians were redeemed from the *vain converſation, received by Tradition from their fathers*, 1 Pet. 1. 18. *Stephen* tells the *Jews*, *Act.* 7. 51, 52, [*As your Fathers did, ſo do ye: Which of the Prophets have not your Fathers perſecuted?*] Chriſt condemneth the *Jews* for allowing the *deeds of their fathers*, *Luk.* 11. 47, 48. *Mat.* 23. 32. Nay, God asketh wicked men, *Where their fathers are?* with a clean contrary meaning to this queſtion of the Papiſts, Zach. 1. 4, 5, 6, [*Turn unto me, ſaith the Lord of Hoſts; Be not as your fathers, unto whom the former Prophets have cryed, Turn ——. Your fathers, where are they; and the Prophets, do they live for ever?*] Ezek. 20. 18, 27, 30, [*I ſaid unto their*

children, ——*Walk ye not in the Statutes of your Fathers, neither observe their judgements, nor defile your selves with their Idols: I am the Lord your God, Walk in my Statutes* ———. 30, *Say unto the house of* Israel, *Thus saith the Lord God; Are ye polluted after the manner of your fathers? and commit ye whoredom after their abominations?*] Jer. 44. 9, [*Have ye forgotten the wickedness of your fathers* ——— *? They are not humbled even to this day.*] The 18 of *Ezek.* is almost all of this; that the son that followeth his father in his sins, shall die, and he that takes warning and avoideth his fathers sins, shall live. A hundred more such texts there are.

7. Our fore-fathers might be saved that sinned in the dark, and yet we be damned if we will follow them in the Light; or at least we shall be beaten with more stripes than they, if both must perish. They had not our means, or liberty. If they had seen and heard what we have done, many of them would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. Shall we sin wilfully after the knowledge of the Truth, because our fathers sinned ignorantly for want of information?

CHAP.

CHAP. XLII.

Detect. 33. ANother of their frauds is, *By pretending to a Divine Institution, and Natural excellency, of a visible Monarchical Government of the Church. And so they would derive it from* Peter, *from Christ, yea from Nature, and God the Author of Nature.*

All their writings take this as their strength. I shall at this time tie my self to *Boverius* his *Cheating Consultation, de Ratione veræ fidei, &c. ad Carolum Principem*, intended for the perverting of our late King then in *Spain*.

In his *Part.* 1. *Reg.* 6. he asserteth that [*besides Christ the invisible Head of the Church, there is a necessity that we acknowledge another certain visible Head subrogate to Christ, and instituted of him, without which none can be a member of Christ, or any way subsist alive.*] (Yet Cardinal *Richlieu* will not have the Pope called *Another Head.*)

He begins his proof with a cheat, as gross as common, even an abuse of *Cyprians* words, *l.* 1. *Ep.* 3. where *Cyprian* speaks for the necessity of obeying *One in the Church*, meaning a *particular Church*, (as the whole scope of his Epistle testifieth): And this man would make the simple believe that he speaks of the *Universal Church*.

His Reasons proceed thus: *First* (p. 128. &c.) *he tells us*, that [*the invisible God thinks meet to Govern the world by visible men.*] *Answ.* And who denies that Christ also governeth his Church by men?

But he concludeth hence [*Num alia ratione*, &c. *Shall we believe that Christ doth govern his Church in*

another way than God governeth the whole world?] *Answ.* Reader, doth not this man give up the cause of the Pope, and say as much against it fundamentally as a Protestant? Saith *Boverius* [*We must not believe that Christ doth govern the Church in another way than God doth govern the world.*] But (saith common sense and experience) *God doth not govern the whole world by any one (or two, or ten) Universal Vice-monarch: Therefore Christ doth not Govern the Church by any one Universal Vice-monarch.*

His next Reason is, [*Because Christ was a visible Monarch once on earth himself. And if the Church had need of a visible Monarch then, it hath need of it still.*] *Answ.* 1. Here the Reader may see, that it is to no less than to be Christs successor, or a Vice-Christ, that the Pope pretendeth. And then the Reason, if it were of any worth, would as well prove, that there must be one on earth still that may give the Holy Ghost immediately, and make Articles of Faith *de novo*, and *Laws* for the Church (with promise of Salvation,) and may appoint new Offices and Orders in the whole Church, *&c.* And why not one also to live without sin, and to die for our sins, and rise again, and be our Saviour? And why not one to give us his own body and blood in the Sacrament?

2. Christ himself doth oppose himself to all terrestrial inhabitants, saying, [*One is your Master, even Christ.*] And what then? Why [*Be not ye called Masters? But he that is greatest among you, shall be your servant.*] And [*Be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are Brethren,*] Mat. 23. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. Where most evidently he shews that neither *Peter*, or any of his own Disciples were to be called *Masters, as Christ was*, nor was any such to be on earth, and so no *Vice-Christ*; yea that all his

his Apoſtles being Brethren, were not to be Maſters one to another, but ſervants: ſo that here is a plain bar put in againſt any of *Peters* Maſterſhip or Headſhip of the Univerſal Church.

3. We do on theſe and many other Reaſons, deny your conſequence. It follows not that we muſt ſtill have a Chriſt on earth, becauſe we once had.

4. Chriſt hath choſen another Vicar (though inviſible) as *Tertullian* calls him: and that is, the *Holy Ghoſt*, whom he ſent to make ſuch ſupply as was neceſſary, by various gifts proportioned to the ſeveral ſtates and members of the Church.

5. If Chriſt would have left a *Vice-Chriſt* upon earth, which ſhould have been an Eſſential part, even the Head of his Church; he would doubtleſs have plainly expreſſed it in Scripture, and deſcribed his Office and Power, and given him directions to exerciſe it, and us directions how to know which is he, and to obey him: But there is not a word of any ſuch matter in the Scripture, (nor Antiquity); when yet it is a point (if true) of ſuch unſpeakable importance.

6. You might as well feign, that if it were then neceſſary to have twelve or thirteen Apoſtles, it is ſo ſtill: and, if then it was neceſſary to have the gift of tongues and miracles, it is ſo ſtill: which yet the Pope himſelf is void of.

7. It is not enough for your ſilly wit, to ſay its *fit that Chriſt have a Succeſſor*, therefore *he hath one*: but let him that claimeth ſo high an honour as to be the Vice-Chriſt, produce his Commiſſion, and prove his claim if he will be believed.

8. Chriſt is ſtill the viſible Head of his Church, ſeen in Heaven, and as much ſeen over all the world, except *Judea* and *Egypt*, as ever he was. When he was on earth, he was not viſible at *Rome*, *Spain*, *Aſia*, &c. He that is Emperour of the *Turkiſh* Monarchy, perhaps

was never personally an hundred miles from *Constantinople*. The King of *Spain* is no visible Monarch in the *West-Indies*. And if all the world except *Judea* might be without a Present Christ, then why that may not as well as the rest, you must give him an account, if you will tie him to be here resident.

9. And yet if the Pope would usurp no more Power than Christ exercised visibly on earth, it would not be all so bad as it is or hath been. He would not then divide inheritances, nor be a temporal Prince, nor wear a Triple Crown, nor keep so glorious a Court and Retinue, nor depose Princes, nor deny them tribute, nor exempt his Prelates from it, nor from their judgement Seats, nor absolve their Subjects from their fidelity, *&c.* nor trouble the world as now he doth: he would not exercise the power of putting any to death; much less would he set up Inquisitions, to burn poor people for reading the Scriptures, or not being of his mind.

Pag. 133. He makes Christ the *visible Pope while he was on earth*, and tells us that *Promulgating the Gospel, sending Apostles, instituting Sacraments, &c. were* Pontificalia munera, *Papal Offices*. *Answ.* And indeed was Christ a Pope: and is the Pope a Christ? *Jesus* I know, and *Peter* and *Paul* I know: but this Vice-Christ I know not. If indeed the Vice-Christ have power to do these Papal works, to promulgate a new Gospel, to send out Apostles, to institute Sacraments, *&c.* as Christ did, let us but know which be the Popes Sacraments, and which be Christs; which be the Popes Apostles, and which be Christs; and which is the Popes Gospel, and which is Christs, and we shall use them accordingly. The *Law* and *Testimony* will help us to distinguish them.

Pag. 134. He comes to prove that *Christ hath a Successor*: and his first proof is from *Mic.* 2. Let the

the Reader peruſe it, and judge without any help of mine, what proof there is that the Pope is a Vice-Chriſt.

The next is in *Hoſea* 1, which ſpeaketh of the return of the *Iſraelites* from Captivity. Let the Reader make his beſt on it for the Pope, for I think it not worth my labour to confute the Papiſts impudent perverting ſuch Texts as theſe.

By the way he tells us (as *Card. Richlieu* and the reſt commonly do) that [*it's no diſhonour to Chriſt to have a Deputy, no more than for the King of* England *to have a Deputy or Vice-King in* Ireland. *Anſw.* 1. But our firſt queſtion is, *Whether* de facto *ſuch a thing be?* Prove that Chriſt hath Commiſſioned a Vice-Chriſt, and we will not preſume to ſay that he hath diſhonoured himſelf.

2. Though it ſhould not diſhonour Chriſt, it is ſuch a tranſcendent honour to man, as we will not believe that any man hath, that proveth not his claim. It was no diſhonour to the Godhead to be united to the manhood of Chriſt in Perſonal union; but if the Pope ſay, that the Godhead is thus united to his manhood, verily I will not believe him.

3. Though we ſhould not have preſumed to queſtion Chriſt if he had done it, yet we muſt preſume to tell the Pope that he is guilty of diſhonouring Chriſt by his uſurpation. 1. Becauſe he ſets up himſelf as Vice-Chriſt, without his Commiſſion; and takes that to himſelf, that is, Chriſts Prerogative. God ſaith, [*This is my beloved Son in whom I am well-pleaſed, Hear him*]: And the Papiſts ſay of the Pope, [*This is the Vice-Chriſt, Hear him*]. 2. Becauſe the Power of a King is more communicable, than the Power of Chriſt, it being ſuch as is fit for one meer man as well as for another. But the Power of Chriſt is ſuch as no meer man is fit for. The capacity of the Subject is Conſiderable

as Necessary to the reception of the form of Power. He that is God as well as Man is fit for an Universal Monarchy, when he that is meer man is not. From whence we argue thus:

If there was never such a thing by Gods institution as a meer man to be the Christ or Universal Head of the Church, then there is no such thing to be imagined now: But there never was such a thing: Therefore there is no such——

Christ that was the visible Head was God and Man: when the Pope is so, we will believe in him, as his Successor.

4. It would ruine the Church to have built on so sandy a foundation, and to have laid so much work on one that is so unable to perform it. Doubtless common reason tells us, that if God made any one man the Monarch of the whole world (especially leaving his Commission as obscure as the Popes is, were it any) and should not give him a divine or supra-humane strength to execute it, it would be the confusion of the world. I am not well acquainted with the Power of Angels; but I hope without dishonouring them, I may suspect, that the due managing of such an Universal Monarchy is above their abilities: At least I am confident, it is an honour that their Modesty and Reverence of Christ will not permit them to own, as the Pope doth. If this Vice-Christ be not a false Christ, he may apply that of *Heb.* 1, [*Being made so much better than Angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they: For unto which of the Angels said he at any time,*] thou art the Successor of Christ, thou art the Universal Head of the Church? Whether the Pope will be called the Vice-son of God, the Vice-saviour, and say, [*Let all the Angels worship him; sit thou on my right hand,* &c.] I leave to his modesty to consider?

sider? But I must profess here to the Reader, that though my modesty and consciousness of my weakness, hath made me so suspicious, lest I understand not the *Apocalyps*, as to suspend my judgement, whether the Pope be the Antichrist, the Beast, *&c.* yet the reading of their serious immodest arguings, to prove the Pope to be the *Vice-Christ on Earth*, doth exceedingly more increase my suspicion that he is *The Antichrist*. For to be *Peters* Successor, as a first Apostle, is a contemptible thing in these mens eyes. This is not it that they plead for. *Bellarmine* (*ubi supr.*) expressly tells us, that the Pope succeeds not *Peter* as an Apostle. No, it is as a *Vice-Christ* to the whole Church, as *Boverius* here professedly maintaineth. And this they make the Foundation of their Catholick Church, and the acknowledgement of it Essential to every member of it. Which I even tremble to read and think of.

Next *Boverius* comes to his proofs from the New Testament. And those are the same that I have answered (as *Bellarmine*'s) in my [*Safe Religion*], and are an hundred times answered by our writers; and therefore the Reader may excuse me, if I put him to no long trouble about them.

The first is the old [*Tu es* Petrus, *& in hanc* Petram, *&c.*] *Answ.* 1. He doth not say [*Thou art Christ, or the Vice-Christ, or my Successor, or the Universal Monarch of the Church.*] No such words as these. 2. It is Christ himself here that is called the *Rock*, and not *Peter. q. d.* [*Thy name is* Peter *who confessest me, in allusion to which I tell thee, that I whom thou hast confessed am* Petra, *the Rock upon which I will build my Church, which the gates of Hell shall not prevail against.*] As the Apostle saith of the spiritual *Rock*, 1 Cor. 10, [*That Rock was Christ:*] so may I of this.

3. But

3. But if it had been ſpoken of *Peter*, it had been no more than is ſpoken of the other Apoſtles; on whom as on a *Foundation* the Church is ſaid to be built, Jeſus Chriſt himſelf being the head corner ſtone, *Epheſ.* 2. 20.

But what need we more, if we put not out our eyes, than to find in all the New Teſtament, that *Peter* was never called or taken for a Vice-Chriſt by the Apoſtles, (unleſs *ſecundum quid*, as every Embaſſador of Chriſt is, that ſpeaks his meſſage in his ſtead, 2 *Cor.* 5. 19, 20:) and that he never is ſaid to exerciſe any Univerſal Government over the reſt of the Apoſtles, nor ſo much as give them a Law, or Convent them before him, or ſend them out, or do any more in Ruling them, than they Ruling him, nor ſo much as *Paul* did in rebuking him to his face for diſorderly walking, *&c. Gal.* 2. Yea when *Paul* calls them *carnal*, that ſided with *Peter*, though but in the ſame over-valuing way as others did of *Apollos* and *Paul*, ſaying [*I am of* Paul, *and I am of* Apollo, *and I am of* Cephas,] 1 *Cor.* 1. 12. he ſaith to them that ſaid [*I am of Chriſt*], [*Is Chriſt divided?*] as ſhewing that he was the common Univerſal Head and Maſter of them all. But when he mentioneth meer men, he hath no ſuch word: He ſaith not [*Is* Peter *divided?*] But implying all in one, he ſaith [*Was* Paul *crucified for you, or were ye baptized into the name of* Paul?] And [*Who then is* Paul, *and who is* Apollo? (implying alſo, Who is *Peter?*) *but Miniſters by whom ye believed, as the Lord gave to every man*, 1 *Cor.* 3. 5.] See 1 *Cor.* 4. 6.

Pag. 144. *Bovcrius* plays his game with Metaphors and Similitudes, and ſaith [*The Church is Chriſts Kingdom, an Army, a Sheepfold, a Houſe, a Ship, or* Noah's *Ark; and what's a Kingdom without a viſible King: or an Army without a Viſible General: or a Flock without*

out a visible Shepheard: or a House without a House-holder: or a Ship without a Pilot?] *Answ.* 1. The whole earth is Gods Kingdom. And can he not Govern it without a Visible Monarch? Why then did the world never hear of such a man? Yea the whole world is the Kingdom of Christ himself, though not in that special sort as his Church is: *For all Power in heaven and earth is given him*, Mat. 28. 18, 19. and *for that end he Dyed, Rose and Revived, that he might be Lord of the Dead and Living*, Rom. 14. 9. and *he is made Head over all things to the Church*, *Eph.* 1. 22, 23. And hath this Kingdom an Universal Visible Monarch? Yes: The Pope is the man: Long hath he laid claim to it. Princes, you see whose hands your Crowns and Kingdoms are in: Deceive not your selves, they are the Popes: For certainly they are all Christs, and, if he be to be believed, he is the Vice-Christ, and so succeedeth him in the Monarchy of the world. But then why doth not this simple Pope lay claim to the Empire of *Indostan*, and *Tartarie*, and *China*, and *Constantinople*, as well as of these smaller Kingdoms of *Europe*?

2. And for the Metaphorical title of an *Army*; I answer, It sufficeth that it hath an Universal General in Heaven, that can command it twice as well there as the Pope can on earth, yea and is as Visible to the Antipodes, yea to me, as ever the Pope was. All the world is Gods Army: But I will not say that the Pope or any man is General of it (save Christ,) nor will I call him, *The Lord of Hosts.*

3. And for the *Sheepfold* of Christ, he hath appointed particular Shepheards to watch for the several parts of the flock. But if one man were to look to all the sheep in the world, he would make such work as the Pope would do with the sheep of Christ. If you tell us still that Christ is out of sight, I answer, He is even

at

at hand: he *is coming:* he will not be long: In the mean time it is the duty of every Paſtor [*to feed the flock of God that is among them ... not as Lords over Gods Heritage* (as the Vice-Chriſt would be:) and when *the chief Shepheard doth appear, we ſhall receive the Crown,*] 1 *Pet.* 5. 1, 2, 3, 4. *Peter* never dreamed, poor man, that he was the chief Shepheard himſelf.

4. For the Metaphor of a *Family*, I anſwer, That God can Govern all the Families in the world: and when the Pope can do ſo, then all the world ſhall acknowledge him the Maſter of the Family. Till then we have learned that the whole Family of Heaven and Earth is named of God, and of the Redeemer God-and-Man: but not of the Pope of *Rome*.

5. And for the ſimilitude of a *Ship*, I anſwer, One man can Govern a ſhip of the common ſize; but a ſhip as big as all the world, I think no man but Chriſt can govern: And ſo confident am I in this opinion, that I profeſs I will not be in that ſhip as big as the world which the Pope ſhall undertake to Govern, if I do but know how to get out of it.

Pag. 146. He goes on to tell us, that *even the bruits have their Governours*; and inſtanceth in *the Bees*. *Anſw.* I am not well acquainted with *Irrational Governours or Governments:* but ſeriouſly it is no Article of my faith, that one *Bee can Govern all the Bees in the world:* nor one Ape all the Apes in the world. Let it ſuffice the Pope that every particular Church be a *Bee-hive*, and every *Hive* have its proper Governour.

Next he again tells Prince *Charles* [*that we ſhould not deny that to the Church which we ſee is neceſſary to all humane Societies.*] *Anſw.* Was this man in his wits! Have *all Societies*, or *any Society* an Univerſal Humane Governour? Who is it that is the Univerſal Chancellor of all the Academies on Earth? Who is it

that

that is the Ruler of all the Colledges of Physitians in the world? I know what Schoolmaster we have in our own School here; but I never heard of an Universal Schoolmaster for all the world; nor for all *England*. Who is the Universal Governour of all the Companies of Merchants in the world? Or who is the Universal King?

In the Conclusion he gathers up all into seven reasons, *Why the Church should have a Vice-Christ*, [1. *That the militant Church might be like the triumphant, who have one Invisible Head.*] *Answ.* 1. Christ is visible to the Church in Heaven. 2. When you have proved that any meer man is Christ, or Head in Heaven, then we will grant that a meer man shall be Christ, and Head on Earth. 3. Earth is not yet fit to be conformed to Heaven in its Government. 4. Is it not the truest conformity, that Heaven and Earth have one and the same Lord, though visible to them and not to us, yet ruling us by visible officers? 5. But if this will not serve, let's have on earth a visible Government: therefore let us have no Pope that is invisible to almost all the world; but Pastors that are visible in their particular Churches.

2. The second Reason is [*That the militant Church differ not from it self, but as each particular Church hath one Visible Head or Pastor, so the whole should have.*] *Answ.* 1. Content, if the Pope can shew as good a Commission for the whole, and be as able to Govern the whole, and will really be present with the whole, and visible to them. 2. Is the world unlike it self, if all the world have not one King, as every particular Kingdom hath? Or one Schoolmaster, as every particular School hath?

The third Reason is [*For preserving Unity.*] *Answ.* 1. And well it is done by you! And what unity will you keep at the Antipodes? Or in the vast dominions of Heathen and Mahometan Princes, where Christians

ſtians are diſperſed. But you come not neer them. 2. We have a better unity already in One God, One Chriſt, One Spirit, One Goſpel, One Baptiſm, One Hope, *&c.* 3. The Mahometans have more unity than you.

The fourth Reaſon is [*To fulfil the doctrine of the Prophets and Chriſt.*] *Anſw.* You ſhould have better ſhewed ſuch a doctrine before you had made uſe of it as a reaſon.

The fifth Reaſon is [*That the Chriſtian Church may be like the Jewiſh.*] *Anſw.* When the Chriſtian univerſal Church is no bigger than the Jewiſh, that one may Govern it as well, we will hearken to you: Let the Pope undertake no larger a Circuit.

The ſixth Reaſon is [*That there may be ſome one Supream judge to puniſh Biſhops, and define matters of faith, call Councils, extinguiſh hereſies and ſchiſms.*] *Anſw.* 1. One Chriſt is enough for the Catholick Church for all theſe uſes. I find the Articles of faith as well defined by Chriſt, as by the Vice-Chriſt. I have ſearcht the writings both of Chriſt and the Vice-Chriſt, and in my poor judgement there is no compariſon between them, nor hath the Pope one jot mended the Scripture. 2. And for Hereſies and Schiſms, Chriſt hath extinguiſht many, but for ought I ſee the Pope rather increaſeth them. In good ſadneſs, did God ſend *John* the twenty ſecond, *alias* the twenty third, to extinguiſh Hereſies, with all thoſe Abominations and all that Infidelity that was charged on him by a General Council? And was *John* the thirteenth a Vice-Chriſt to extinguiſh Hereſies by all that diabolical villany that he was depoſed for by a Council? 3. And for *calling Councils*, they have learnt more wit, ſince *Conſtance* and *Baſil* have let them know what Councils mean to do by them. Unleſs they can pack up forty or fifty (or what if it were an hundred, or

two

two hundred?) as they did at *Trent*, to say their lesson as it was brought to them from *Rome*, and to call themselves a General Council for folks to laugh at them. Is this all that we must have a Vice-Christ for? How many General Councils did the Pope call for six hundred years after Christ? Tell us without Lying, and let us see why he was created.

The seventh Reason is [*That the Divine Institution of Christ, and the plain Scriptures about* Peters *Primacy may take place.*] *Answ.* 1. Where shall a man that hath eyes find your pretended institution? The blind may sooner find it by the half. 2. Primacy and Monarchy are not all one. And *Bellarmine* can tell you, that it's one thing to be the first Apostle, and another thing to be the Vice-Christ to the Church Universal. *Peter* was none such. 3. No nor was he properly any more the Bishop of *Rome* than of many another place. *Antioch* claims the inheritance by birth-right, as *Peters* first supposed seat, and *Jerusalem* before them both.

Well, Reader thou seest now how *Babel* is built, and what is the strongest stuff that the learned Spaniards had to assault Prince *Charls* with: For verily I have not bawkt their strength: And were it not for the loss of precious time to you and me, I would quickly thus shew you the vanity of abundance more of their most applauded writings.

CHAP.

CHAP. XLIII.

Detect. 34. ANother of their Devices is, *to take nothing as Evidence from Scripture, but the Letters or expreſs words.*

They will not endure to hear of conſequences, no nor Synonymal expreſſions. *Bellarmine* himſelf ſaith (*de verb. Dei, lib.* 3. *cap.* 3,) [*Convenit inter nos & adverſarios, ex ſolo literali ſenſu, peti debere argumenta efficacia: nam eum ſenſum qui ex verbis immediate colligitur, certum eſt ſenſum eſſe ſpiritus ſancti.*] But this may admit a fair interpretation. It was Cardinal *Peronius* in his Reply againſt King *James* that is judged the deviſer of this *Deceit:* but *Gonterius* and *Veronius* the Jeſuites have perfected it. I ſhall ſay but little of it, becauſe it is already detected and refelled by *Paul. Ferrius* 1618, and *Iſaacus Chorinus* 1623, and *Nic. Vedelius* 1628, at large. Yea *Vedelius* ſhews, *cap.* 6. *p.* 50. *&c.* that it was hatcht in *Germany* by the Lutherans for the defending of Conſubſtantiation, and from them borrowed by the Revolter *Perron.*

For our parts, the cunning Sophiſters ſhall find us very Reaſonable with them in this point: but if they be faln out with Reaſon it ſelf, there's no way to pleaſe them but by turning bruits. And we will not buy their favour at thoſe rates.

Our judgement in this point, I ſhall lay down diſtinctly, though briefly, as followeth. 1. The Holy Scripture is the Doctrine, Teſtament and Law of Chriſt. And we ſhall add nothing to it, nor take ought from it. The uſe of it as a doctrine, is to inform us of the will of God in the points there written. The uſe of it as a Teſtament, is to ſignifie to us the laſt will of our Lord

Lord concerning our duty and Salvation. The use of it as a Law, is to appoint us our Duty and Reward, or Punishment; and to be the Rule of our obedience, and in a sort, the Rule by which we shall be judged.

2. All Laws are made to Reasonable creatures, and suppose the use of Reason for the understanding them. To use Reason about the Law, is not to add to the Law.

3. The subject must have this use of Reason to discern the sence of the Law that he may obey it. And the judge must Rationally pass the sentence by it.

4. This is the Application of the Law to the fact and person: And though the fact and person be not in the Law, yet the Application of the Law to the fact and person is no addition to it. Otherwise to use any such thing would be to add to it.

5. As the fact is distinct from the Law, so must the sentence of the Judge be, which results from both.

6. To speak the same sence or thing in equipollent terms, is not to add to the Law in matter or sence: else we must not translate.

7. Yet we maintain the Scripture sufficiency *in suo genere*, in terms and sence: So that we shall confess that equipollent words are only Holy Scripture as to sence, but not as to the terms; even translations themselves.

8. But there is no Law but may many wayes be broken, and no Doctrine but may be divers ways opposed. And therefore though we yield, that nothing but the express words of God are the Scripture, for terms and sence, yet many thousand words may be against Scripture, that be not there expressly forbidden in terms.

9. The Law of Nature is Gods Law, and the Light of Nature is his Revelation. And therefore that which the Light of Nature ſeeth immediately in Nature, or that which it ſeeth from Scripture and Nature compared together, and ſoundly concludeth from theſe premiſes, is truly a revelation from God.

10. The Concluſion followeth the more debile of the Premiſes, in point of evidence or certainty to us. Where Scripture is the more debile, there the concluſion is of Scripture faith: but where the fact or Propoſition from the Light of Nature is more debile, there the concluſion is of Natural Evidence: But in both, of Divine diſcovery. For there is no Truth and Light but from God the Father of Lights. This is our judgement herein.

Now for the Papiſts, you may ſee their folly thus; 1. If nothing but the bare words of a Law may be heard in Tryals, then all Laws in the world are void and vain. For the ſubjects be not all named in them; nor the fact named: And what then have witneſſes, and jurors, and judges to do? The Promiſe ſaith, *He that believeth ſhall be ſaved:* But it doth not ſay that *Bellarmine* or *Veronius* believeth: Doth it follow, that therefore they may make no uſe of it for the comforting of their ſouls in the hopes of Salvation? The Threatning ſaith, *that he that believeth not is condemned:* But it ſaith not *that ſuch or ſuch a man believeth not:* Should they not therefore fear the threatning?

2. By this trick they would condemn Chriſt himſelf alſo, as adding to the Law in judgement. He will ſay to them, *I was hungry and ye fed me not*, &c. But where ſaid the Scripture ſo, *that ſuch or ſuch* a man fed not Chriſt? It needs not: Chriſt knows the fact without the Scripture. The Scripture is ſufficient to its own uſe, to be the Rule of Obedience and Judgement:

ment: but it is not sufficient to every other use which it was never made for. The Law said to *Cain*, *Thou shalt not murder*. But it said not to him, *Thou hast killed thy brother, therefore thou shalt die*. It was the Judges part to deliver this.

3. By this trick they would give a man leave to vent any Blasphemy, or do any villany, changing but the name. But they shall find that the Law intended not bare words, but by words to signifie things: And if they do the things prohibited, or hold the opinions condemned, whatever names or words they cloath them with, they shall feel the punishment.

4. By this they would leave almost nothing proveable by the Scripture, seeing a Papist or Heretick may put the same into other terms, and then call for the Proof of that. For example, they may ask where God commandeth or instituteth any one of the Sacraments in Scripture? And when we tell them where Baptism and the Lords Supper were instituted, they may reply, that there is no mention of Sacraments; and so turn real Controversies into verbal.

5. Yea it seems by this they would make all Translations to be of little use. And a man might lawfully sin in *English*, because God forbad it only in *Hebrew* and *Greek*.

6. If this be the way of it, let us remember that they must in Reason stand to their own Rules. Let them tell us then what Scripture saith, that *Peter was the Vicar of Christ*, or the *Head of the Catholick Church: or the Bishop of* Rome, or that *the Pope is his Successor*, or that *the Pope is the Vice-Christ*, *or Universal Bishop*. Where is there expres Scripture for any of this? Yea so much as *Bellarmines* Literal sence?

7. And why do not these blind and partial men see, that the same course also must be taken with their own

Laws? And that all their Decretals and Canons are insufficient, according to these Rules. It's easie for any Heretick to form up his Error into other words than those condemned by Pope or Council: And if you go again to the Pope, and get him to condemn those new expressions, the men in *Mexico* may use them long to the detriment of the souls of men, before the damnatory sentence be brought to them. And when it comes, they can again word their Heresie anew. The *Jansenists* in *France* shew how well the Popes decision of wordy Controversies is understood, and doth avail. But really if they will hold that no part of the *Popes Laws* oblige but in the literal sense, or that none offend that violate not the Letter, they will make a great alteration in their affairs. And perhaps any of their subjects may Blaspheme the Pope himself in *French*, *Dutch*, *Irish*, *English*, *Slavonian*, &c. because he forbids it only in *Latine*; For if *Translations* be not Gods Word, then they are not the *Popes* word neither. A pretty crochet for a Jesuite. It is *mendacium*, and not *a Lye*, that the Pope forbids. It is said that a *Traytor* or *Murderer* may be hang'd: but it is not said that such or such a man shall be hang'd; or that he was a traytor or murderer.

Their common instance is, [*The Scripture no where calls it self the whole word of God; nor no where tells us which be Canonical Books*, &c. *and yet these are Articles of Faith.*] *Answ.* 1. The Scripture doth call it self the Word of God, and signifie its own sufficiency, and several Books have particular testimonies to be Canonical. 2. Though Secondarily so far as Scripture affirmeth its own Divinity, it be to be believed: yet Primarily, that this is Gods Word, and that these are the Books, and that they are not corrupted, and that they are all, *&c.* are points of knowledge antecedent in order of nature

nature to Divine Belief of them. There are two great Foundations antecedent to the Matter of Divine Faith. The one is *Gods veracity*; that *God cannot lie*: The other is, *His Revelation*; that *This is Gods Word*: The first is the *Formal Object* of Faith; The second is a *Necessary Medium* between the *formal object* and the *subject*, *sine quo non*, without which there is no possibility of Believing. The *Material object* called the *Articles of Faith*, presuppose both these, as points of Knowledge, proved to us by their proper evidence. And that this is *All the Word of God*, is a meer Consequence, from the actual Tradition of this much and no more.

To give you an undenyable illustration by instance. Let us enquire *which be the Administring Laws of this Common-wealth*. And we shall find that 1. *The Authority of the Law-givers is none of* them; for that is in the *Constitution*, before the *Administration*: and it is the *formale objectum* of every *Law*, which is more noble than the *Material object*. 2. And the *Promulgation of these Laws*, is not it self a Law; but a *necessary Medium*, *sine quo non*, to the actual obligation of the Law. 3. And *that there is no other Laws but these*, is not a Law; but a point known by the *non-promulgation of more*. 4. And that all these Laws are the same that they pretend to be, and that they are not changed or depraved since, this is not a Law neither, but a Truth to be proved by Common Reason, from the Evidences that may be brought from Records, Practise, and abundance more.

So is it in our Case. 1. *That God is True*, and the *Soveraign Rector*, is a point first to be known by evidence; the one being the formal object of Faith, and the other the formal object of obedience: and easily proved by Natural Light, before we come to Scripture. 2. And that *this is Gods Revelation*, *or Promulgation of*

his Law, is a point also first to be proved by Reason; not *before* we see the Book or hear the Word, but *out of* the Book or Doctrine it self, (*propria luce*,) together with the full Historical Evidence, and many other reasons, which in order of Nature lie before our Obligation, *fide divina*, to *believe*. So that this is not Primarily an Article of Faith, but somewhat higher, as being the Necessary *Medium* of our believing. 3. And that *there is no other Law, or Faith*, is not *Primarily* a Law or Article of Faith, but a Truth proved by the *Non-Revelation* or *Promulgation* of any other to the world. He that will prove us obliged to believe more, must prove the valid Promulgation or Revelation of more. 4. And that these Books are the same, and not corrupted, is not directly and primarily an Article of Faith, but an Historical verity to be proved as abovesaid. And yet *secondarily*, Scripture is a witness to all or most of these, and so they are *de fide*. But of this I refer the Reader for fuller satisfaction to my Preface before my second Part of the *Saints Rest*.

And thus it is manifest, that it is an unreasonable demand of the Papists to call for express Scripture, for these that are not Articles of Faith in proper sence.

CHAP.

CHAP. XLIV.

Detect. 35. ONe of their Practical Deceits consisteth in the *chooſing of ſuch perſons to diſpute with, againſt whom they find that they have ſome notable advantage.*

1. Commonly they deal with women and ignorant people in ſecret, who they know are not able to gainſay their falſeſt, ſillieſt reaſonings.

2. If they deal with a *Miniſter*, it is uſually with one that hath ſome at leaſt of theſe diſadvantages. 1. Either with ſome young or weak unſtudyed man, that is not verſt in their way of Controverſie. 2. Or one that is not of ſo voluble and plauſible a tongue as others. For they know how much the tonguing and toning of the matter doth take with the common people. 3. Or with one that hath a diſcontented people, that bear him ſome ill will, and are ready to hearken to any one that contradicteth him. 4. Or elſe with one that hath fixt upon ſome unwarrantable notions, and is like to deal with them upon terms that will not hold. And if they ſee one hole in a mans way of arguing, they will turn all the brunt of the Contention upon that, as if the diſcovery of his peculiar Errour or weakneſs were the Confutation of his Cauſe. And none give them greater advantage here, than thoſe that run into ſome contrary extream. They think to be Orthodox by going as far from Popery as the furtheſt. About many notions in the matter of *Juſtification*, *certainty of Salvation*, the *nature of Faith*, the *uſe of Works*, &c. they will be ſure to go with the furtheſt: And a Jeſuite will deſire no better ſport, than to have the baiting of one that holds any ſuch opinion, as he knows himſelf eaſily able

to disgrace. One unsound Opinion or Argument is a great disadvantage to the most learned Disputant. Most of all the insultings and success of the Papists, is from some such unsound passages that they pick up from some Writers of our own (as I said before.) And they set all those together, and tell the world that *This is the Protestant Religion.* Just as if I should give the Description of a Nobleman from all the blemishes that ever I saw in any Nobleman. As if I have seen one *crook-backt*, another *blind*, another *lame*, another *dumb*, another *deaf*, another a *whoremonger*, another a *drunkard*, &c. I should say, that A *Nobleman is a whoremonger, and drunkard*, &c. *that hath neither eyes, nor ears, nor limbs to bear him*, &c. So deal they by Protestants: And what a Character could we give of Papists on these terms?

But I would intreat all the Ministers of Christ to take heed of giving them any such advantage. By over-doing, and running too far into contrary extreams, you will sooner advantage them, and give them the day, than the weakest Disputants that stand on safer grounds. Inconsiderate heat, and self-conceitedness, and making a faction of Religion, is it that carryeth many into extreams: when Judgement, and Charity, and Experience, are all for Moderation, and standing on safe ground. A *Davenant*, a *Lud. Crocius*, a *Camero*, a *Dallæus*, &c. will more successfully confute an *Arminian*, than a *Maccovius*, a ——— so it is here. The world sees in the Answer of *Knot*, what an advantage *Chillingworth* had by his Principles: when the Jesuite having little but the reproachful slander of a *Socinian name and cause* to answer with, hath lost the day, and shewed the world how little can be said for Popery.

CHAP.

CHAP. XLV.

Detect. 36. ANother of their Practical frauds is *in ſeeking to Divide the Proteſtants among themſelves, or to break them into Sects, or poyſon the ductile ſort with Hereſies, and then to draw them to ſome odious practices, to caſt a diſgrace on the Proteſtant Cauſe.*

In this and ſuch Helliſh practiſes as this, they have been more ſucceſsful than in all their Diſputations. But whether the Cauſe be of Heaven or Hell that muſt be thus upheld, I leave to the conſiderate to judge.

What they have done abroad in this way, I leave others to enquire that are more fit; But we all ſmart by what they have done at home.

Yet this I may well ſay, that if their own ſecular Prieſts are to be believed, (as *Watſon* and many more,) it is their Jeſuites that have ſet many Nations in thoſe flames, whoſe cauſe the world hath not obſerved. And I may well ſet down the words of a Prieſt of their own, *John Brown, aged ſeventy two, in his Voluntary Confeſſion to a Committee of Parliament*, as it is in Mr. *Prins Introduct. pag.* 202.

Saith he, [*The whole Chriſtian world doth acknowledge the prediction which the Univerſity of* Paris *did foreſee in two ſeveral Decrees they made* Anno 1565, *when the Society of Jeſuites did labour to be members of that Univerſity:* Hoc genus hominum natus eſt ad interitum Chriſtianæ Reipublicæ & ſubverſionem literarum. *They were the only cauſe of the troubles which fell*

fell out in Muſcovie, *when under pretence to reduce the Latine Church, and plant themſelves, and deſtroy the Greek Church, the poor King* Demetrius *and his Queen, and thoſe that followed him from* Polonia, *were all in one night murdered by the monſtrous Uſurper of the Crown, and the true progeny rooted out. They were the only cauſe that moved the Swedes to take Arms againſt their lawful King* Sigiſmund, *and chaſed him to* Poland: *and neither he nor his ſucceſſors were ever able to take poſſeſſion of* Sweden. *For the Jeſuites intention was to bring in the Romiſh Religion, and root out Proteſtants. They were the only cauſe that moved the* Polonians *to take Arms againſt the ſaid* Sigiſmund, *becauſe they had perſwaded him to marry two ſiſters, one after the other; both of the houſe of* Auſtria. *They have been the ſole cauſe of the war entered in* Germany, *ſince the year one thouſand ſix hundred and nineteen, as Pope* Paulus 5 *told the General of their Order, called* Viceleſcus; *for their avarice, pretending to take all the Church lands from the Huſſites in* Bohemia *to themſelves; which hath cauſed the death of many thouſand by ſword, famine and peſtilence in* Germany. *They have been the cauſe of civil wars in* France; *during all which time moving the French King to take Arms againſt his own ſubjects the Proteſtants, where innumerable people have loſt their lives, as the ſiege of* Rochell *and other places will give ſufficient proof. For the Jeſuites intentions were to ſet their ſociety in all Cities and Towns conquered by the King, and quite to aboliſh the Proteſtants. They were the cauſe of the murder of the laſt King of* France. *They were the only projectors of the Gunpowder Treaſon, and their Penitents the actors thereof. They were the only cauſe (namely Father* Parſons,) *that incenſed the Pope*

to

to ſend ſo many fulminate Breves to theſe Kingdoms, to hinder the Oath of Allegiance and lawful Obedience to their temporal Prince, that they might ſtill fiſh in troubled waters. Their damnable doctrine to deſtroy and depoſe Kings, hath been the cauſe of the Civil wars, likely to befall theſe Kingdoms, if God in mercy do not ſtop it.] So far the Popiſh Prieſt.

You ſee here, if their own pens are to be credited, thoſe very Actions of the Swedes, Germans, French, which they caſt as a reproach in the face of the Proteſtant, (as you may ſee in a Book called *The Image of the two Churches,*) were indeed their own, and to be laid at their own doors. I omit abundance of better proof, becauſe I will give them the words of none but themſelves in this.

How far they were the cauſes of the old broils in *Scotland*, *Knox* and *Spotſwood*, and all their later Hiſtories will tell you.

How buſie they were in *England* in Queen *Elizabeths* dayes, the Popes Bulls, and the many Treacheries committed ſignifie. But of theſe matters I will now ſay no more, but referr the Reader to Dr. *Pet. Moulin's* anſwer to *Philanax Anglicus*, after abundance written by Engliſh Biſhops to the ſame purpoſe.

CHAP.

CHAP. XLVI.

Detect. 37. ANother Practical fraud of the Papists is, *In hiding themselves and their Religion, that they may do their work with the more advantage.*

I shall tell you briefly, 1. The way by which they do this, and 2. The advantage they get by it. And 3. Help you to detect them.

1. The principal means by which they conceal themselves is, *By thrusting themselves into all Sects and Parties, and putting on the vizor of any side, as their cause requireth.* It's well known that formerly we had abundance of them that went under the name of Protestants, and were commonly called by the name of *Church-Papists:* But there is great reason to think that there are more such now. Some of them are *Prelatists*, and some of them call themselves *Independants*, some creep in among the *Anabaptists*, and some go under the cloak of *Arminians*, and some of *Socinians*, and some of *Millenaries*, and all the other Sects before-mentioned. They *animate* the *Behmenists*, and other *Enthusiasts*, the *Seekers*, the *Quakers*, the *Origenists*, and all the *Juglers* and *Hiders* of the times. It is they that keep life in *Libertinism*, and in *Infidelity* it self. Among every one of these parties you may find them, if you have the skill of unmasking them.

2. Another way of *Hiding* themselves is, by having a *Dispensation to come to any of our Assemblies*, or join in worship with any party, good or bad. Or else they will prove it lawful without a Dispensation, where the Pope interdicteth it not. And their way is this: that all the old known Papists, especially of the poorer sort, shall

shall be still forbidden to come to our Assemblies, lest they bring the blot of levity and temporizing on their Religion, and lest there should not be a visible party among them to countenance their cause. But the New profelites, especially such as are of any power and interest in the world, and may do them more service in a masked way, and can fairly avoid the Imputation of Popery, these shall have leave to come to our Assemblies, when their cause may make advantage of it. That you may see I feign not all this of them (besides the proof from certain experience which we daily see,) let me lay before you the Decisions of one of their principal *Directors*, in this work *of propagating their faith*; and that is, *Thom. à Jesu de Convers. Gentium.* How far they are for favouring of Heathens and Infidels, and Liberty of Conscience for them (for all their cruelty to Protestants,) you may see him, *lib.* 5. *Dub.* 4. *pag.* 207. where he tells you that the sentence commonly received in the Schools is, that it is not lawful for Christian Princes to use any force against Infidels, for sins against the Law of Nature it self: and citeth *Cajet. Victoria, Covarruv. Greg. de valent.* And himself decides it in the middle way of *Azorius*; [*That Pagans may not be punished for despising the honour and worship of God, though they may for not giving every man his own, and for theft, murder, false witness, and other sins that are against mens right.*]

And *lib.* 5. *part.* 1. *Dub.* 6. *pag.* 220. he teacheth, that [*A Catholick living among Hereticks may (when the scandalizing of others forbids it not) for fear of death, go to the Temples of hereticks, and be among them in their meetings, and assemblies, because of it self it is a thing indifferent; For a man may for many causes go to the Temples of hereticks, and be among them in their assemblies; as, that he may the easilyer*

and

and more effectually and commodiously confute their errours, or on other just occasions, (unless accidentally it scandalize others.) Yea as Azorius *saith, he may do it to obey a Prince, though he be an heretick, when he feareth the loss of his honour, maintenance or life: For in this he only obeyeth his Prince: especially if among the faithful* (that is, the Papists) *he openly affirm, that he doth it only to obey his Prince, and not to profess the heretical sect: For by that open attestation he avoideth the offence and danger of Catholicks, and well declineth the unjust vexation of the Prince.*

And that Papists may *eat flesh on dayes when their Church forbids it, to hide themselves among hereticks*, he determineth *in Dub.* 5. *p.* 218, 219. So that the Papists are abundantly provided for their security, against such as would discover them when it stands not with their ends to disclose themselves.

3. Another most effectual way of *Hiding themselves* is, by *Equivocation* or *mental reservations*, which we use to call Lying, when they are examined about their Religion, their Orders or their actions. Lying that hurteth not another, they commonly maintain to be but a venial sin, which say most of them, is properly no sin at all. And to equivocate or reserve one half of your answer to your selves, say the Jesuites, is not Lying, nor unlawful, in case a mans interest requireth him to do it. See the words of their own Casuists cited for this by *Montaltus the Jansenist*. Were it a thing that needed proof, I would give you enough of it. *Thom. à Jesu the Carmelite, ubi sup. Dub.* 4. *pag.* 218, secureth them sufficiently: His Question is [*Whether one that denyeth it when he is asked of a Heretick whether he be a Priest, or a Religious*

Religious man, or whether he heard Divine ſervice, do ſin againſt the confeſſion of faith?] He anſwereth, [*No: for that is no denying himſelf to be a Chriſtian, or Catholick: For it is lawful to diſſemble or hide the perſon of a Clergy-man or a Religious man, without a lye in words, leſt a man be betrayed and in danger of his life; and for the ſame cauſe he may lay by his Habit, omit prayers,* &c.——— *becauſe* (N. B.) *humane Laws for the moſt part bind not the ſubjects conſcience, when there is great hazard of life, as in this caſe* Azorius *hath well taught. Juſt. Mor. Tom.* 1. *lib.* 8. *c.* 27.] So that by the conſent of moſt, there is no danger to a Papiſt in any ſuch caſe from his own confeſſion.

Another way of *Hiding their Religion* and themſelves, is by *falſe Oaths*, which we call wilful perjury, but the Jeſuites take for a Lawful thing, when a *mental Reſervation* or *Equivocation* ſupplyeth the want of verbal truth, as their words cited by the forementioned *Janſenian*, teſtifie. And who will ever want ſo eaſie, ſo obvious, ſo cheap a Remedy againſt all danger of perjury, as a *mental Reſervation* is?

Yea that the Pope can ſufficiently diſpenſe with any of their Oaths of fidelity or Allegiance, or the like, I ſhall ſhew you under the laſt Detection. The Parliament hath impoſed on them an Oath of Abjuration, but do they not know how little the Clergy, and ſuch as have their countenance will ſtick at that. Such Nets are too wide to catch them in. Hear the words of one of their own Prieſts (*Jo. Browns Voluntary Confeſſ. in Prins Introduct. p.* 203.) Saith he, [*It's ſtrange to ſee the Stratagems which they uſe with their penitents concerning the Oath of Allegiance! If they be poor, they tell them flatly,* (*when they are demanded*

to

to take the Oath) that it is damnable, and no wayes to be allowed by the Church: If they be of the richer ſort, they ſay they may do as their conſcience will inſpire them. And there be ſome of them that make no conſcience at all, to have it taken ſo oft as they are demanded.] What would you have more, than ſuch diſcoveries by themſelves?

2. *But what get they by this Hiding of themſelves? Anſw.* 1. They hereby ſecure themſelves from danger. 2. They do the more eaſily prevail for the multiplication of their ſect: For worldly perſons would not ſo eaſily flock in to them without ſome ſuch ſecurity from ſuffering. 3. They preſerve thoſe that are come over to them from revolting, by the diſcouragement of ſuffering, eſpecially the Rich and Honourable. 4. They angle for ſouls with the leſs ſuſpicion, when they ſtand behind the buſh: Papiſts are become ſo diſtaſted with the people by the Powder-plot, and many other of their pranks, that they make take more with them, if they come masked under another name. 5. By this means they may openly revile and oppoſe the Miniſtry, and Ordinances, Churches, and Proteſtant doctrine, without diſturbance by the Magiſtrate. A Papiſt in the Coat of a Quaker, an Anabaptiſt, a Seeker, or the like, may rail at us and our doctrine in the open Streets, and Market-place, and call us all to naught, and teach abundance of their own Opinions, without controul. And many a poor ſoul will take an Anabaptiſt Papiſt, or Seeker into their boſome, and familiarly hear them, and eaſily ſwallow down what they ſay, that would be afraid of them if he knew them to be Papiſts. 6. By this means they have eaſier acceſs to a greater number than openly they could have. 7. And by this means they may inſinuate into our Counſels, and know all our wayes, and how to reſiſt us. 8. But above all, by this

this means they may be capable of any office and truſt among us. They may be Miniſters, or Juſtices of Peace, *&c.* They may have a great influence on the reſt that know them not: It's eaſie therefore to diſcern that their principal Artifice lyeth in Hiding themſelves (ſo be it ſtill there be a viſible body of their open profeſſors.) And I confeſs I think an ingenuous Papiſt ſhould have a great deal more gentle dealing from our Magiſtrates, than theſe *Deceivers* that have ſuch ſtretching Conſciences. For my own part I muſt confeſs I feel a great deal of charity in my heart for a conſcientious plain dealing Papiſt; and I would never be guilty of cruelty or rigour to them. But this *Jugling* in the matters of God and Eternal life, my very ſoul abhors. I have been ſet upon by theſe *Juglers* my ſelf, and by ſome of the moſt renowned of them; but as ſoon as I perceived any of them purpoſely chooſe the dark, and hide themſelves in affected cloudy terms or methods, I was more averſe from their documents, and took them for men that were either enemies to truth, or elſe had not received it into honeſt hearts themſelves. Truth is moſt beautiful in its nakedneſs: It loveth plain dealing, and abhorreth fraud. It takes that for its greateſt friend, that layes it moſt naked to the view of all, and that for its enemy that purpoſely obſcureth it. We have all ſuch a natural inclination to truth, that he ſcarce deſerves the name of a man, much leſs of a Chriſtian, that would not embrace it if he knew it. Did I think that the Papiſts had the truth, the Lord knows I would run after them, and follow them till I had learned it. If ever any of them would work on me, they muſt come bare faced: for I naturally abhor a Jugler in Religion, and a friend of darkneſs.

3. *But how ſhall theſe Hiders be Detected? Anſw.* 1. You have cauſe to *ſuſpect* all that uſe a *Mask*, and purpoſely hide their minds. To ſuſpect them I ſay, to be Papiſts or worſe: They walk not in Gods way that walk in Darkneſs: It is the Kingdom of Satan that is the Kingdom of Darkneſs, and it is he that is the Prince of Darkneſs, and his ſervants that are the ſons of Darkneſs. Me thinks a man that intendeth Deceit, what ever his end be, ſhould not take it ill to be ſuſpected for a deceiver. God is ſo good a maſter that no body ſhould be aſhamed of him. Truth is ſo amiable, that the genuine ſons of Truth are not aſhamed of it. It's no true Religion that aſſureth not men of that which will ſave them harmleſs, and bear them out againſt all the malice of earth and hell, and repair all loſſes that they can ſuſtain in the defending of it. *Qui non vult intelligi, debet negligi.* He that would not be fully underſtood, ſhall never be my Teacher, nor be much regarded by me. Who will not ſuſpect that Tradeſmans wares that chooſeth a dark Shop, and refuſeth to open his wares in the light? I know that Scripture hath its difficulties, and ſtrong meats. But that is from our incapacity of underſtanding higher points, till we are prepared by the lower: It is from the altitude of the matter, and not that God doth envy us the truth, which he pretendeth to reveal. If a Propheſie be purpoſely obſcured, which concerneth not the world ſo nearly, yet ſo are not the Doctrines that our life or death lyeth on. But ſaith *Clem. Writer* to me, (recited in his late Book againſt me,) [*Would you not hide your mind or Religion in* Spain?] *Anſw.* 1. No: I would not, whenever I found my ſelf capable of ſerving God moſt by the diſcovery; which is the common caſe. 2. Till then, I would not put on the vizor of any thing that I knew

to

to be falſe, and make uſe of Poſitive Jugling and Diſſembling to hide my Religion. 3. If Chriſtians among Infidels, or Proteſtants among Papiſts, had thought this diſſimulation lawful, there had not been ſo many thouſands of them martyred or murdered as were. 4. What Opinion is it that brings men in *England* into any great danger at this day? Either your Opinion muſt be Atheiſtical, or at leaſt Infidelity, if you ſuppoſe it will bring you now into any great ſuffering: or if it be ſome ſmall matter that you fear, it ſeems you think not your Religion worthy to be openly owned in ſo ſmall a danger. I'le never be of a Religion that is not worthy my openeſt confeſſion; even to the death, when there is ſo much danger.

2. The Jugling Papiſts may be known by this, that they are alwayes looſening people from their Religion, and leading them into a diſlike of what they have been taught; that they may be receptive of their new Impreſſions. And therefore of any one Sect in *England*, there is none to be ſo much ſuſpected of a ſpirit of *Jeſuitiſm*, as the *Seekers* of all ſorts.

3. The Jugling Papiſts may be much detected by this, that they are all upon the *Deſtructive* part in their Diſputes, and very little on the *Aſſertive* part. They pull down with both hands, but tell you not what they will build up, till they have prepared you for the diſcovery. They tell you what they are againſt: But what they are for, you cannot draw out of them. As if any wiſe man will leave his houſe or grounds till he knows where to be better: or will forſake his ſtaff that he leaneth on, or the food that he feedeth on, till he know where to have a better proviſion or ſupport. *Do* they think wiſe men will be made irreligious? They deal by the poor people, as one that ſhould ſay to paſſengers on Shipboard [*What fools are*

you to venture your lives in such a ship that hath so much encumbrance and danger, and so many flaws, and but a few inches between you and death, and is guided by such a Pilot as may betray you, or cast away your lives for ought you know?] They know now that none but mad men will be perswaded by such words as these to leap into the Sea to scape these dangers: and therefore they do this but to make men willing to pass into their ship, and take them for their Pilots. If you are wise therefore hold them to it, and leap not over-board, but keep where you are, till they have shewed you a safer Vessel and Pilot: which they can never do.

When I did but privately desire of *Cl. Writer* that he would acquaint me with that truth that he thought me ignorant of, and that we might privately and lovingly consider how far we were agreed, and where we differed, that we might debate the case, and try who was in the right, he resolutely denyed to have any debate with me, or to open any of his judgement; but *pag.* 46. reproacheth this very motion, as proceeding from [*my aims of a monstrous shape and ugly looks:*] so monstrous a thing doth it appear to these deceiving Juglers, to tell men what Religion they are of, and would have us to receive; when they will freely reproach the Religion which we profess.

4. And you may strongly conjecture at the quality of these Juglers, by their constant *opposition against the Ministry.* It is *Ministers* that are their eye-sore; the hinderers of their Kingdom: Could they but get down these, the work were done, the day were their own: And therefore their main business, whatever vizor they put on, is to bring the people into a dislike or contempt of the Ministry. If they seem Quakers, they will rail at them: If they seem Seekers, they will

will diſpute againſt their calling: If they ſeem the gentleſt Behmeniſts, they have their girds at them, to acquaint the world that they are miſguided by them. But at firſt, they will not let you know which is the true Miniſtry, if ours be not; or which is the true Church, if ours be not: Here they leave you.

5. The Jugling Papiſt, what vizor ſoever he wears, is commonly putting in for his own opinions, of the *Neceſſity of a Judge of Controverſies, an Infallible Church, a ſtate of perfection here, the magnifying of our own inherent Righteouſneſs*, without any great eſteem of *Juſtification by the forgiveneſs of ſin*: and many ſuch like.

6. Papiſts have ſtill an aking tooth at the *Authority and ſufficiency of Scripture*; and therefore on one pretence or other, are ſtill diſgracing and impugning it, and leading men aſide to ſome other Rule.

7. Papiſts have ſtill an enmity againſt the *Power of the Magiſtrate in matters of Religion*: For in ſuch matters their *Vice-Chriſt* muſt be the only Judge. Whereas indeed, by that time the *Magiſtrate* hath judged, *Who is Puniſhable by the Sword*, and the *Paſtors* and *Particular Churches* have judged, *Who is excommunicable* (which are their undoubted works,) there is nothing left for a Pope to do. Suſpect them that are for a Liberty for all; or at leaſt for all that are no worſe than Papiſts. They that ſet open this door intend to creep in at it themſelves at laſt.

8. And it is a ſuſpicious ſign when you find men enemies to the Unity, Peace and Settlement of our Churches, but would ſtill keep us in diviſion and diſtraction. And yet ſome of theſe men will lament our

Diviſions, and cry up Unity, but they will ſecretly hinder it, or do nothing to attain it.

9. And it is ſomewhat ſuſpicious to ſee men hang looſe from all our Churches in their practice, and joyn with none, nor communicate in the Sacraments. If they know not Sacraments and Church-Communion to be both our Duty, and the Means of our ſtrength and comfort, it is doubtful whether they are Chriſtians or Infidels. But if they know this of the Neceſſity and uſe of Sacraments, and Church-Communion in general, and yet joyn not with any of our Churches herein, it's a ſhrewd ſuſpicion that they have an eye upon ſome other Church. For ſure a tender Conſcience would not be many years in reſolving of ſo great and practical a point, no more than he would live many years without prayer on pretence of being unſatisfied in the mode of Prayer.

10. And yet on the contrary ſide, there are ſome Jugling Papiſts, that play their game by over-doing, and making every thing to be Popiſh and Antichriſtian, to drive us into extreams, and into opinions in which we may eaſily be baffled. And it's not a little that they have won of us at this game.

CHAP.

CHAP. XLVII.

Detect. 38. ANother of their Practical Frauds is, *In their exceeding induſtry for the perverting of men of Power and Intereſt, that are likely to do much in helping or hindering them.*

Swarms of them are buſie day and night, for the ſeducing of Princes, and Nobles, and Rulers of all ſorts, and of Commanders in the Armies. Of their diligence abroad we may know ſomewhat by their ſucceſs on divers of the *German* Princes, and the late Queen of *Sweden*, and on many of the Nobles of *France*, and ſuch others.

At home we have had experience of their induſtry. What abundance of aſſaults were made on the late King, from his going to *Spain*, and the Popes Letters to him there, and to the Biſhop of *Conchen* to take care for his ſeduction, and ſo all along to the laſt, I need not mention. And what Noblemen or Perſons of Intereſt in *England* lay not under aſſaults and ſolicitations? And are all the Jeſuites and Fryars dead? Or have they not ſtill the ſame cauſe and induſtry as then? Is the Nobility, or Gentry now free from their fraudulent ſolicitations? How far they have prevailed time will fullier reveal: but what they will endeavour we may eaſily judge. And certainly the number of *Seekers* and ſuch other Sects, doth tell us that they have not loſt their labour.

If theſe lines ſhall fall into the hands of any of our Nobles and Magiſtrates, I intreat them for the ſake of

their ſouls, and the Common-wealth, to be prudent and vigilant in a matter of ſuch conſequence. I do not intend to intreat them from errour unto truth without ſufficient light and evidence: But that which I deſire is but reaſonable.

1. That you would not be too confident of your own underſtandings to deal with ſuch Juglers in your own ſtrength, without aſſiſtance. They have made it their ſtudy all their dayes, and are purpoſely trained up to deceive: whereas you are much wanting in their way of ſtudy, and much unfurniſhed to reſiſt, how highly ſoever you may think of your ſelves.

2. That you would read a little more the learned ſolid writings of our Divines againſt the Papiſts; ſuch as Dr. *Fields*, *Uſhers*, *Chillingworths*, *Jewels*, *Rivets*, *Chamiers*, *Ames*, *Reignolds*, *Whittakers*, and ſuch like, Sir *Humfrey Linds Via Devia*, *& via Tuta*, (*& du Pleſſis* of the Church, and his Myſterie of Iniquity, and Dr. *John White*, &c.)

3. That you will not hearken to Papiſts ſecretly, nor masked, nor coming to you by indirect and Jugling ways: but open their perſwaſions, and call to ſome able ſtudyed Divines to deal with them in your hearing, if needs you will hear them, that ſo you may hear one ſide as well as the other.

4. That you take heed what Retainers, Servants, or Familiars are about you: For ſome that pretend to be acquainted with theſe men, are much miſtaken, if they be not more frequent at your elbows, and in your Bed-chambers, than many do imagine. If they cannot be of your Councils, and your near attendants, they will rather be your Porters, or the Grooms of your Stables, than they will be kept out.

We

We fear not any thing that they can do in an open way, in comparison of their secret whispers and deceits, when there is no body to gainsay them. Had they the Truth, we should be glad to entertain it with them. It is not therefore Truth in their mouths that we are afraid of: But seeing the Nations and our Posterity have so much dependance on your Integrity, we call for so much Justice at your hands, as that you will not cast open your ears to each deceiver, especially in secret, or on unequal terms. Let not all our peace and safety be hazarded by the self-conceitedness, or imprudence of you that are our Rulers. Seeing it is you that must govern us or set the Vulgar the pattern which they are so much addicted to imitate, We adjure you in the Name of the most High God, that you be not too forward and facile in hearkening to Seducers, and corrupting those Intellects which the whole Nation hath so great an Interest in: and that you be not henceforth as children tost to and fro, and carryed about with every wind of doctrine by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness whereby they lye in wait to deceive, *Ephes.* 4. 14. But we beseech you mark them which cause Divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which you have learned, and avoid them. For they that are such, serve not the Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly, and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple, *Rom.* 16. 17, 18. Hearken not to every one that saith, Lo here is Christ, or Lo there is Christ; here is the Catholick Church, or there is the Catholick Church. As if Christ were divided, or the Catholick Church were more than One, or it were confined to a Sect or Party, whether Papal or any other, and did not contain all Christians

ſtians through the world. All parts of this Church are not equally pure, but all are Parts: Be you of the pureſt part, but do not therefore take that part for the whole: much leſs the polluted part. Have compaſſion on the diſeaſed and tumified part: but do not therefore ſo far doat, as to love the tumor or diſeaſe, and ſay that none is the Church but this. We are willing to be as Charitable to that Proud Throne of *Rome*, and uſurping Vice-Chriſt, as will ſtand with the ſafety of our ſouls and of the Church. But God forbid that we ſhould therefore be ſo blind, as to run into their Peſt-houſe, and drink the poyſon by which they are thus tumified and intoxicated.

Look on their Principles, and ſee what an aſpect they have on Chriſt, on the Catholick Church, and upon Princes. Look back on their Practices, and ſee what their Principles proved in the fruits. Yea what need we go further for a warning, than to remind you of that which one would think ſhould be deep and freſh in your minds; even what they have brought upon Kings, Queens, Lords, Prelates, and this whole Land? But this leads me to the next Detection.

CHAP.

CHAP. XLVIII.

Detect. 39. THe laſt of their Practical frauds (at home,) and the moſt deſperate is, *Their Treaſons againſt the lives of Princes, and the Peace of Nations, and their diſſolving the bonds of Oaths and Covenants, and making Perjury and Rebellion to ſeem to be Duties and Meritorious works.*

It would be a voluminous task to relate the Hiſtories of the Papal Treaſons: How the *Roman* Vice-Chriſt having laid a claim to both Swords, Spiritual and Temporal, hath plaid the Traytor againſt the *Greek* Emperours, diſpoſſeſſing them of the Weſt; and againſt the Emperours of *Germany*, ſtirring up their own ſubjects, and the Chriſtian Princes and States againſt them; ſetting his foot on the neck of one, and making another wait barefoot long at the *Roman* gates; and keeping many of them in wars. It was this horrid Treaſon and Tyrannical uſurpation over all the Chriſtian Princes, that cauſed all thoſe Treatiſes on that ſubject wrote againſt him, in the Defence of Princes and their Rights, which *Mich. Goldaſtus* hath preſerved and conjoyned in divers Volumes. It was this that cauſed *England*, *Denmark*, *Sweden*, and ſo many other Princes, to be the readier to ſhake off his yoke. Kings are not fully Kings where the Pope is fully Pope; except only the Houſe of *Auſtria*, whom he is forced to gratifie, as the only prop of all his tyranny. *France* that hath ſo much ſtood for its Liberties, hath felt the fruits of the *Roman* Principles, and League; and two of their moſt renowned Kings ſucceſſively have been baſely and inhumanely butchered by them: And to this day the numerous ſwarm of the Popes dependant Clergy,

Clergy, doth not only devour, as is thought, about a third part of the Lands, but alſo aws and ſwaies the Princes. Even in *Ireland* before our wars, a Biſhop (*Bedle* in his Letter to *Laud* in *Prins* Introduct. *pag.* 102.) doth open the Power of the Clergie and their inſolencies, as ſuch that he concludes, [*His Majeſty is now with the greateſt part of this Countrey as to their hearts and conſciences, King, but at the Popes diſcretion.*] And in another Letter to the ſaid Archbiſhop (*ibid. p.* 112,) he ſaith [*I that know that in this Kingdom of his Majeſty, the Pope hath another Kingdom far greater in number, and as I have heretofore ſignified to the Lords Juſtices, and Council, (which ſince is juſtified by themſelves in print,) conſtantly guided and directed by the order of the new Congregation,* de propaganda fide, *lately erected at* Rome — .] See the reſt.

Do I need to tell *England* of the many treacheries ſince the Reformation againſt our Princes? Or who it was that would have depoſed as well as Excommunicated Queen *Elizabeth*, and expoſed her Kingdoms to the will of others? Or who it was that wrote againſt King *James* his Title to the Crown? Or who were the Actors of the Helliſh Powder-plot? Or who it is that hath been ſtill blowing the fire, and caſting all into diſturbances for their ends? Do I need to mention their approving of the Murdering of Princes, and the pretence of power to diſpenſe with oaths of Allegiance and fidelity, and who hath actually ſo oft pretended to diſoblige the ſubjects, and expoſe Princes and their Dominions to the firſt occupant? I know that many of the Seculars in *England* diſowned this doctrine: But 1. So never did the Pope, but hath owned and practiſed it. 2. By diſowning it, they diſown Popery it ſelf, if they know what they do. For it is an Article of their Faith; and ſo Eſſential to their Religion, as explicitly held;

and

and is determined by a Pope and an approved General Council, even 12, the fourth at *Lateran* under *Innocent* the third, as I before recited the words at large in the third Argument against them here.

I know some of the Papists would perswade the world that it was none but *Mariana* the Jesuite that wrote for King-killing: and that it was first condemned by themselves. But the Parliament of *Paris* tells another story of them, as it is recited by *Thuanus* (who was President and then present,) *Hist. lib.* 130. *ad an.* 1604. And *Rivet* names them, *Gnignardus* (that wrote in praise of the murder of *Henry* the third,) *Odo Pichenatus*, *Barterius* suborned by *Varada*, &c. And *Albineus* the Jesuite did hear the Murderer of *Henry* the fourth confess before he did the fact, and put off the examiners with this answer, that God had given him that special gift to forget when once he had absolved a sinner whatsoever was confessed by him. And why was it that *France* did expel the Jesuites, and set up a Pillar of Remembrance of their villanies, till *Henry* the fourth would needs gratifie the Pope by calling them in again, and told the Parliament, that the peril of it should be on him: and so it was; for it cost him his life. And why did the same Parliament of *Paris*, *Novemb.* 1610, condemn *Bellarmines* book against *Barclay*, as an engine of treason and rebellion? And the Theological faculty of *Paris*, *April* 4. 1626, condemned *Santarellus* Book as guilty of the same villany, stirring up people to Rebellion and King-killing. And *May* 12 the University confirmed it: And *March* 13 the Parliament condemned the Book to be burnt.

And it's worth the reading which *Rivet* recites of the Answers of the Jesuites in *Paris*, when the Parliament askt them their judgement of that Book, *viz.* [*Seeing their General had approved the Book, and judged*

judged the things that are there written to be certain, whether they were of the ſame mind?] They anſwered that [*Living at* Rome *he could not but approve what was there approved of.*] But ſay the Parliament, [*What think you?* Say the Jeſuites, *the clean contrary.* Say the Examiners, *But what would you do if you were at* Rome? Say the Jeſuites, *That which they do that are at* Rome. At which ſaid ſome of the Parliament, *What! have they one Conſcience at* Rome, *and another at* Paris? *God bleſs us from ſuch Confeſſors as theſe.*]

But yet ſome of the Papiſts will ſeem ſo honeſt, as to ſay that *private men may not kill a King till he be depoſed.* Very true! But withall it is their currant doctrine, that if once he be excommunicate, he is then no King, yea or if he be an Heretick; and ſo being *no King*, they may kill the man, and not kill the King. This is the jugling of theſe ſeeming Loyal ſubjects. You may ſee it in their own writings; *Suarez adverſ. Sect. Anglic. lib. 6. cap. 4. Sect. 14. & cap. 6. Sect. 22, 24. & Azorius Jeſuita Inſtit. Moral. part. 1. l. 8. c. 13.* He that would ſee more of their mind in this, let him read the *Myſterium Patrum Jeſuitarum*, and the *Janſenians myſterie of Jeſuitiſm*, and Biſhop *Rob. Abbots Antilogia ad Apolog. Eudæmojohan:* But what need we more than the Decrees of a Pope and General Council, and the practice of the Church of *Rome* for ſo many ages?

And for the Popes power to abſolve them from all oaths of Allegiance and fidelity, the foreſaid Pope *Innocent* and his approved General Council have told the world enough of their mind to put us out of doubt of it.

But (leaving abundance of forreign inſtances) I I ſhall mention but one or two at home. The Papiſts have lately had the confidence to affirm that the Powder-plot and the Spaniſh invaſion in one thouſand five hundred

dred eighty eight were not upon a quarrel of Religion, nor owned by the Pope. King *James* hath said already so much against them in these points, that I think it needless to say any more (especially also after Bishop *Abbots Antilogia*,) but only here to produce one Testimony of their own, concerning the Spanish Invasion.

Cardinal *Ossatus* in his 87. *Epist. ad D. de Ville-roy*, tells us that Pope *Clement* the eighth (one of the best of all the late ones,) did press for the King of *France* to join with *Spain* in the Invasion of *England*, and the Cardinal answered that the King was tied by an Oath to the Queen of *England:* to which the Pope replyed, that [*The Oath was made to an Heretick, but he was bound in another Oath to God and the Pope,*] adding withall [*that Kings and other Princes do permit themselves all things* (or tolerate themselves in all things) *which make for their commodity: and that the matter is gone so far, that it is not* (or should not be) *imputed to them, or taken for their fault: and he alledged the* saying of *Franciscus Mariæ Duke of* Urbine, *that indeed every one doth blame a Noble man, or Great man that is no Soveraign, if he keep not his Covenants,* (*or fidelity,*) *and they account him infamous; but supream Princes may without any danger of their reputation, make Covenants and break them, lye, betray, and perpetrate other such like things.*] This was good Pope *Clement* the eighth. And can we look for better from the rest? You see what Oaths and Covenants are with them.

And that the design was still carried on against the Queen upon account of Religion, and the Realm to have been invaded by the *Spaniard* on that account, and that the principal point of the Plot was to prepare a party within the Realm that might adhere to the invaders;

vaders; all this with much more Sir *Francis Walsingham* (that well knew,) hath testified to *Monsieur Critoy* in his Letter, *Cabal. part. 2. pag.* 39.

Thuanus a Moderate Papist (and a most knowing and impartial Historian) *tells you* (lib. 80. p. 248, 249, ad an. 1588.) that, [*the Spaniards pretended to undertake the expedition only for Religion sake, and therefore took with them* Martin Alarco *Vicar general of the Holy Inquisition, with abundance of Capuchins and Jesuites; and that they had with them the Popes Bull, which they were to publish as soon as they landed; and that Cardinal* Allan *was appointed as the Popes Legate, to land at the same time, and with full power to see to the restoring of Religion; and that the said Bull had these expressions: that the Pope, by the Power given from God by lawful succession of the Catholick Church, for the defection of* Henry *the eighth who forcibly separated himself and his people from the communion of Christians, which was promoted by* Edward *the sixth and* Elizabeth, *who being pertinacious and impenitent in the same Rebellion and Usurpation* ——— *therefore (the Pope) incited by the continual perswasions of many, and by the supplicant prayers of the English men themselves, (N.B.) hath dealt with divers Princes, and specially the most potent King of* Spain ——— *to depose that woman, and punish her pernicious adherents in that Kingdom* ———.] Read the rest there; for though wicked, it's worth the reading. The Pope there saith, that *Pope* Sixtus *before him proscribed the Queen, and took from her all her Dignities, Titles, and Rights to the Kingdom of* England *and* Ireland, *absolving her subjects from the Oath of fidelity and obedience: He chargeth all men on pain of the wrath of God, that they afford her no favour, help, or aid, but use all their strength to bring her to punishment; and that all the English join with*

with the Spaniard as soon as he is landed: offering rewards and pardon of sins, to them that will lay hands on the Queen; and so shewing on what Conditions he gave the Kingdom *to* Philip *of* Spain.] This and more you may see in *Thuanus*.

And yet some of our Juglers that say they are no Papists, perswade the world that Papists hold not the deposing of Princes, nor absolving their subjects from the Oaths of fidelity; and that the Spanish invasion was meerly on Civil accounts, and that they expected not any English Papists to assist them: with other such impudent assertions.

Even *Dominicus Bannes* (one of the best of them,) *in Thom. 22. qu. 12. art. 2,* saith, that [*Quando adest evidens notitia, &c.* i. e. *When there is evident knowledge of the crime, subjects may lawfully exempt themselves from the Power of their Princes, before any declaratory sentence of a judge, so they have but strength to do it.*] Adding to excuse the English Papists for being no worse, that [*Hence it follows that the faithful (Papists) of* England *and* Saxony *are to be excused, that do not free themselves from the power of their Superiours, nor make war against them: because commonly they are not strong enough to manage these wars, and great dangers hang over them.*] Princes may see now how far the Papists are to be trusted: Even as far as they are sufficiently disabled.

And their *August. Triumphus* saith *(de Potest. Eccles. qu. 46. art. 2,)* [*Dubium non est quin Papa possit omnes Reges, cum subest causa rationabilis deponere:*] i. e. [*There is no doubt but the Pope may depose all Kings, when there is reasonable cause for it.*] Is not this a *Vice-Christ*, and *a Vice-God* with a witness?

Add but to this, that the Pope is Judge when the cause is Reasonable; (for no doubt but he must judge,

if he must execute ;) and then you have a Pope in his colours, even in his Universal Soveraignty Spiritual and Temporal.

And (as I said before from *Suarez* and others,) *When the Pope hath deposed a King, any man may kill him.* I will not trouble you with *Mariana*'s directions for poysoning him, or secretly dispatching him (*de Reg. instit. lib.* 1. *cap.* 7 :) *Suarez* his moderate conclusion is enough (*Defens. fid. Cathol. li.* 6. *c.* 4. *sect.* 14,) [*Post sententiam,* &c. *After sentence past he is altogether deprived of his Kingdom, so that he cannot by just title possess it ; therefore from thence forward he may be handled as a meer tyrant ; and consequently any private man may kill him.*] O Learned *Suarez!* No wonder if you and your Profession be dear to Princes ; and if *Henry* the fourth of *France* took down the Pillar of your infamy, and received you into his *Kingdom* and *Heart* again. No wonder if the Venetians at last have re-admitted you, to procure some aid against the Turk.

I will conclude with one Testimony of a Roman Rabbi (cited by Bishop *Usher*, who knew his name, but would not do him the honour to name him.) It is, *B.P.* ἐξέτασι *Epistol.* J. R. *impress. an.* 1609, who hath excused the Powder-plot from the Imputation of cruelty, [*because both Seeds and Root of an evil herb must be destroyed* ;] and doth add a derision of the simplicity of the King in imposing on them the oath of Allegiance, in these most memorable expressions, worthy to be engraven on a Marble Pillar, [*Sed vide in tanta astutia, quanta sit simplicitas !* &c. *But see what simplicity here is in so great craft ! When he had placed all his security in that Oath, he thought he had framed such a manner of oath, with so many circumstances, which no man could any way dissolve with a safe conscience. But he could*

could not see, that if the Pope dissolve the Oath, all its knots, whether of being faithful to the King, or of admitting no Dispensation, are accordingly dissolved. Yea I will say a thing more admirable, You know I believe, that an unjust Oath, if it be evidently known to be such, or openly declared such, obligeth no man. That the Kings oath is unjust, is sufficiently declared by the Pastor of the Church himself. You see now that the Obligation of it is vanished into smoak, and that the bond which so many wise men thought was made of iron, is less than straw.]

These are the words of Papists themselves. From their published writings we tell you their Religion.

I know they will here again tell us abundance of false accusations of the Protestants, such as [*the Image of both Churches*] heapeth up; and they will tell us of our wars, and *killing the King* in England. But of this I shall now only say: 1. How few Kings had not Wars with their own subjects all the time that Popery prevailed, from the Conquest till the Reformation? 2. When Lawyers, Statesmen and Usurpers draw in some Ministers and people to them that are young and unexperienced, upon pretence that the Law is on their side, the Religion of Protestants is not to be judged by this, but by it self in its own visible evidence. Our *Religion, ut in norma Objective*, is nothing but the holy Scripture: And is this against Loyalty?

I do here make this solemn profession which I think few of my brethren do dissent from, if any: [I do firmly hold all that honour, obedience and submission to be due from subjects to their Kings, which is required in any part of the holy Scripture, yea and in any General Council, or the confession of any Christian Church on Earth, that ever I yet saw: And I renounce all writings, Covenants, doctrines, or practices, to the contrary: I hold that it

is unlawful to raise Arms against the King; that is, either his Authority or person, his Laws or any authorized by him: And that it is unlawful for Pope or any forreigner or subject without his own consent to dishonour him by an excommunication: And that they that maintain that the Pope may excommunicate Protestant Princes as hereticks and then depose them, and dissolve their subjects Oaths of fidelity, and give their Dominions to others, are enemies to Kings and to the peace of Kingdoms.]

This is my Profession, and all that is contrary to it I again renounce. And if the Papists will do the like, God forbid that I should reproach the innocent with other mens crimes, which they disclaim: But if the Lateran Council make Papal excommunicating and deposing Princes to be as truly their Religion as the Scripture is ours, then it is their Religion and not mens practises only that I condemn; which they cannot say by ours. The Protestant doctrine expressed in the Confessions of all their Churches, and in the constant stream of their writers, is for obedience to the Sovereign Powers, and against resisting them, upon any pretenses of Heresie, or Excommunication, or such like. Read Mr. *Prins* Speech for Agreement with the King: and read the writing of the *London* Ministers presented to the General, and published against the Kings death: and read the Vindication of the Secluded members: and read the Passages of the war with *Scotland*, and of the Imprisonment of many *London* Ministers, and of the death of Mr. *Love* and others: and tell me whether you can do men greater wrong than to defame them for being owners of that which they disowned, though it cost them the loss of Liberty, Estate, or Life. The world knows that the Prayers, the Petitions, Protestations, and other endeavours of the Protestants, even the Presbyterians, was for the preventing the death of that King.

This

This is the very truth, which they that have been eye-witneſſes all along have good reaſon to know, whatever any Papiſt ſay to the contrary. 5. And Renounce your treacherous Principles, and we will ceaſe to charge you with them. Let a General Council and Pope but Decree the contrary to what the forecited Pope and General Council have Decreed, or elſe do you all declare that you think this Pope and Council erred, and then we will ſhake hands with you; for then you will either ceaſe to be true Papiſts, or at leaſt become tolerable members of humane ſocieties. Why doth not the Pope himſelf at leaſt condemn theſe doctrines, if really he diſown them? The caſe is too plain.

CHAP. XLIX.

Detect. 40. THeir laſt courſe when all other fail, is, *To turn from Fraud to Force, and open Violence, ſtirring up Princes to wars and bloodſhed*, that they may deſtroy the profeſſors of the Reformed Religion, as far as they are able, and do that by flames and ſword, by halters and hatchets, which they cannot do by Argument. Hence have proceeded the bloody butcheries of the poor *Waldenſes* and *Albigenſes*, formerly and now again of late, and the wars in *Bohemia*, the League and wars and Maſſacres in *France*, the deſolating wars of *Germany*, the Plots, Invaſions and wars in *England*. Moſt of the flames in *Chriſtendom* of late ages have been kindled for the Pope by his Agents, that he might warm him by that fire that others are conſumed by. Hence his own pretenſes to the Temporal Sword, and ſo many volumes written to juſtifie it, and ſo many Tragedies acted in the execution. And yet theſe men cry up *Antiquity and Tradition.*

dition. I wonder what Bishop in all the world for above three hundred years after Christ, did ever claim or exercise the temporal sword, as much as to be a Justice of Peace? nay it was their judgement that it did not belong to them. Neither the Pope nor any Bishop on earth, as such, hath any thing to do with the coercive power of the sword; nor may not inflict the smallest penalty on body or purse, but only guide men by the Word of God; and the utmost penalty they can inflict is, to excommunicate them. And they have nothing to do to destroy men, when they have excommunicated them, nor to cause the Magistrate to do it: but rather should still endeavour their Conversion. *Synesius Epistol.* 57, against *Andronicus* saith as followeth [ὅτι πολιτικὴν &c. *To join together secular government with the Priesthood, is to tye together things that are incoherent (or such as cannot be tyed together.) The old times made the same men Priests and Judges: For the Ægyptians and Hebrews did long make use of the Government of Priests. But afterward, as seems to me, when Gods work began to be done in an humane manner, God separated the two sorts of life, and one of them was made sacred, and the other appointed for Rule and Command. For some he turned to these Material (or common, secular) things, and some he associated with himself: The former were appointed for secular business; the later for prayer. But from both doth God require that which is honest (or Good.) Why then dost thou revoke this? Why wilt thou conjoin what God hath separated? who wouldst not have us indeed to do the work of secular Rulers, but by doing it to deprave (or mar) it; than which what can be more unhappy? Dost thou need a Ruler (or Patron?) Go to him that manageth the Laws of the Commonwealth. Dost thou need God in any thing? Go to the Bishop (or Priest) of the City: not that thou*

shalt

shalt be sure there to have all that thou desirest, but that I will afford thee the best assistance that I can (or will do my best in it).] So far *Synesius*: Which I wonder how *Petavius* could pass over without some distorting observation, considering how low it treads the Roman Kingdom. But *Baronius* had the cunning as to extract even from hence some advantage to his cause, even to shew the Power that Pastors have to excommunicate Rulers (*ad An.* 411,) as *Synesius* with the Council did *Andronicus*. But 1. He went not out of his own circuit to play the Bishop in other mens Dioceses. 2. Much less did he take up the Temporal Sword against him, but disclaimeth and detesteth any such thing. Why doth not the Pope when he hath past his Excommunications, content himself that he hath done his part; but he must excite Princes, yea force them to execute his rage, and fall upon the Lives and Dominions of such Princes as he will call Heretical? He knows how small account would be made of his bruitish thunderbolts, if he had not a secular Arm to follow them: Nay why is he and many of his Cardinals and Bishops, secular Princes themselves? Why joyneth he those Functions of Magistracy and Priesthood which *Synesius* here tells us God hath separated, and made incoherent in one and the same person? Let the Pope usurp what Ecclesiastical power he please, he would not so much disturb the Church by it, if he did not second it by another power. It is violence that he trusteth to. He knows if it were not for Arms and Violence, he would soon be spewed out by the Christian world. And yet many of his followers that seem more moderate, confess he hath nothing to do as Pope with any but the Spiritual Sword (which works no farther than Conscience doth consent and yield.) And yet his Kingdom standeth on those legs, which the doctrine of these more moderate men do disown.

The same doctrine also *Bernard* taught the Pope himself, *Ad Eugen. P. R. de Consideratione. l. 2.* saying [*Quid tibi dimisit S. Apostolus? &c. What did the holy Apostle leave thee? Such as I have saith he, that give I to thee: And what was that? One thing I am sure of; it was not gold, nor silver, when he said himself, Silver and gold have I none. If thou canst claim this by any other title, so let it be; but not by Apostolical right: For he could not give thee that which he had not: such as he had, he gave, a care of the Churches, but did he give thee a domination? Hear himself* [*Not as Lords (or Ruling as Lords) saith he, in the Clergy (or heritage) but as examples of the flock.*] *And lest thou think that he spoke it only in humility, and not in verity, it is the voice of the Lord himself in the Gospel: The Kings of the Gentiles rule over them, and they that have power over them, are called Benefactors, (or Bounteous:) and he inferreth,* [*But you shall not be so.*] *It is plain that Domination is forbidden the Apostles. Go thou therefore, and usurp if thou darest, either Apostleship whilest thou Rulest as a Lord; or a Lordly Rule (or Domination) while thou art Apostolick. Plainly thou art forbidden one of the two: If thou wilt have both alike, thou losest both.*] So far *Bernard.* By whose verdict the Pope and his Bishops are deprived of both, by grasping at both long ago.

Nay the Pope makes himself a Temporal Prince in every Princes Dominion on earth, where he is able to do it, and takes all the Clergy out of their Government into his own. So that actually he hath dispossessed them of part of their Dominion already, by taking so considerable a part of their subjects from under their power, yea and those that have so great an influence upon all the rest. What by publick Preaching, and Church-governing, and secret Confessing, and dependance on them

them for the Sacraments, one would think it ſhould be no hard matter for a *Romiſh* allowed numerous Clergy, to be Maſters of any Kingdom where they are. And thus Princes are more than half conquered already, without a war. If any believe not that the Pope doth not thus exempt his Clergy from the ſecular power, it is becauſe he knows not their moſt notorious principles and practiſes. Nay even in *England*, in King *Charles* his Articles for the *Spaniſh* match, the Pope had the confidence to demand this Prerogative, and therefore himſelf added to the ſixteenth Article, which freed them from Laws about Religion, [*Eccleſiaſtici vero nullis legibus ſubjaceant, niſi ſuorum ſuperiorum Eccleſiaſticorum,*] that is [*Eccleſiaſtick perſons ſhall be under no Law, but of their Superiour Eccleſiaſticks (or Church-men)*]. Is not this plain *Engliſh*? See *Prins Introduct. p.* 6. So that no Church-man muſt be under any Law of the Land, or Government of Secular Princes. And when they have ſuch a ſtrength in our own Garriſons, a forreign Enemy is eaſily let in. To the exciting of whom they will never be wanting, having their Agents, in one garb or other, at the ears of all the Princes and States in Chriſtendom, and of moſt of the Great and Noble perſons that are deeply intereſſed in the Government. Yea, and with Infidel Princes ſometimes, as *Cyril* the Patriarck of *Conſtantinople* proved, to the loſs of his life, for being ſo much againſt the Papiſts. And the more cauſe have all Chriſtian Princes and States to be vigilant againſt theſe incendiaries, 1. Becauſe they truſt to War and Violence, and build their Kingdom on it, and therefore ſtudy it day and night. 2. And becauſe they have ſuch a frie of politick Jeſuites all abroad continually upon the deſign; whoſe contrivances and endeavours are day and night to bring Princes and Nations to their will, and to kindle diviſions and wars among them

to

To attain their Ends. They make a trade of this imployment. And expert prepared men, that follow a busines all their days, are like enough to make something of it at last; especially while others sleep, or silently look on, and let them alone to play their game. If the Papists can but get into the Saddle, either by deceiving the Rulers, or Commanders, or by bringing forreign force against us, they will give us leave to dispute, and write, and preach against them, and laugh at us that will stand talking only; while they are working: And when the Sword is in their hand, they will soon answer all our Arguments, with a fagot, a hatchet, or halter; *Smithfield* confuted the Protestants, that both the Universities could not confute. Their Inquisition is a School where they dispute more advantagiously than in Academies. Though all the Learned men in the world could not confute the poor *Albigenses*, *Waldenses* and *Bohemians*, yet by these Iron Arguments they had men that presently stopt the mouths of many thousands, if not hundred thousands of them: Even as the Mahometans confute the Christians. A Strappado is a knotty Argument. In how few dayes did they confute thirty thousand Protestants in and about *Paris*, till they left them not (on earth) a word to say? In how few weeks space did the ignorant *Irish* thus stop the mouths of two hundred thousand Protestants? Even in *Ulster* alone, as is strongly conjectured, by testimony on Oath, about an hundred and fifty thousand men were mortally silenced: Alas we now find that many of the poor *Irish* know but little more of Christ, but that he is a better man of the two than Saint *Patrick*: And therefore how long might they have been before they could have silenced so many Protestants any other way? There's nothing like *stone-dead*, with a Papist. They love not to tire themselves with Disputes, when the business may be sooner and more successfully dispatcht.

Well,

Well, seeing this is the way that they are resolved on, and no peaceable motions will serve for the preventing it, all men that have care of the Church and Cause of Jesus Christ, and the happiness of their posterity, have cause to stand on their watch and guard: Not to be cruel to them (leave that to themselves,) but to be secured from their cruelty. I should be abundantly more earnest than I am, to press all men to such a patience and submission in Causes of Religion, as leaves all to God alone, but that we all see how the Papists are still at the door with their Swords in their hands, and watching for an opportunity to break in. And if in modesty we stand still and let them alone, they will give us free leave when they have the day, to call them Traytors, or perfidious, or what we please. Let loosers talk: Let them have the Rule, and then make the best you can of your Arguments. If they can once get *England* and other Protestant Countries, into the case of *Spain* and *Italy*, their Treachery shall not be cast in their teeth; for they will leave none alive and at liberty to do it. When we see in good sadness that it is Navies, and Armies, and stabbings of Kings, and Powder-plots, and Massacres that we have to dispute against, it's time to be able to Answer them in their own way, or we lose the day. It is not a good Cause, or wit, or learning, or honesty, that will then serve turn. I know God is all-sufficient for his Church, and in him must be our Trust: But he requireth us to expect his blessing in the use of lawful probable means. He can give us Corn without plowing, and sowing: but we have little reason to forbear these and expect it. He can Convert men without preaching: But yet the blessing of God doth presuppose *Paul*'s planting, and *Apollo*'s watering. He can Rule and Defend us without Magistrates, but it is not his appointed way. And he can save us from deceitful

deceitful bloody men, without our care, and vigilancy, and resistance: but it is not his ordinary appointed course in which he would have us look to him for deliverance.

And therefore in the Name of God let Princes and Parliaments be vigilant: for they watch for the outward security of the Church and Common-wealth (as Ministers do for our spiritual wel-fare,) as those that must give account. And let the people take heed what Parliament or Magistrates they choose. And let all that love the Gospel, and the prosperity of the Christian world, and of their posterity, have their eyes in their heads, and take heed of that bloody hand, that hath in *England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Savoy, Low-countries, Germany, Bohemia*, &c. already spilt so many streams of Christian blood. If the Wise, the Learned, Moderate Lord *du Plessis*, was so zealous for the *Lawfulness of Necessary Defence*, as *Grotius* chargeth him, as to put it into his *Testament*, (whom he injuriously makes also the Author of *Junius Brutus*, I know not on what ground,) doubtless he knew with whom he had to do, and thought that every *Guisian League* was not a Law of God or of the King.

Some Princes think that it is their safest way to please the Pope and Jesuites, and so will be Papists, on the terms as some of the *Indians* worship the Devil, because he is so naught, that he may not hurt them. But these men were wiser, if they understood, that the malice of Infernal Spirits is not to be avoided by pleasing them, but by resisting them: They are too bad to be ever pleased by any means, but what will be our utter ruine. And they are not stronger than the Devil himself, who will flie if we resist him. If the *best* were not the *most Powerful*, what would become of the world? And if God be stronger than the Devil, *he* should rather

rather be pleaſed than the Devil; for he is able to defend you from the Devils diſpleaſure: and he is moſt able to hurt you if you be deſpiſers of his power; which Juſtice will effect more certainly on the bad, than Satans malice can do upon the good. Men think themſelves wiſe, that ſhift for their ſafety by carnal and unlawful means: But they ſhall all find at laſt, that plain honeſty is the beſt policy, and the favour of God the beſt ſecurity, and a life of faith the moſt prudent life; and that ſhifting for your ſelves in unbelieving ways, is the greateſt folly. It is the deſign of the Papiſts by the ſtrokes of *Clements*, *Ravilliacks*, *Vauxes*, and ſuch others, to terrifie Princes, that they may not dare to reſiſt them, but may ſee that they have no hold of their lives while they are under their diſpleaſure. But yet ſuch as have moſt diſpleaſed them have ſcaped beſt. It is recorded by one, that the great King *Henry* of *France*, being perſwaded to ſtand it out againſt the Jeſuites, anſwered, [*Give me ſecurity for my Life then.*] And what a ſecurity did he find in his unbelieving way?

A thouſand pitties it is that Proteſtant Princes ſhould not be united among themſelves, that they might be ſtrengthened for their joynt Defence: But that the envious man ſhould be able ſo far to over-wit them, as to ſow among them the ſeeds of war, while they ſleep, or ſelfiſhly mind their own affairs and intereſts. And a greater pity and ſhame it is, that the Miniſters of the Goſpel of peace ſhould be the cauſes of theſe diviſions, or ſhould not do their beſt to heal them: But it is the greateſt ſhame of all to us, that ſo many years experience of the calamitous effects of our Diviſions, and ſo much induſtry of many worthy peaceable men, ſhould do no more to a fuller Reconciliation than yet is done. The names, and pacifying Labours

of

of such as *Durœus*, *Davenant*, *Hall*, *Morton*, *Usher*, *Hayne*, Dr. *Morin*, *Amyraldus*, *Hottonus*, *Conradus Bergius*, *Johannes Bergius*, *Georgius Calixtus*, *Jerem. Burroughs*, and many more that have laboured for peace, do live as Monuments of their honour and our dishonour, and do reflect much shame upon the faces of those Reformed Ministers and Churches that after all this are so much unreconciled: yea, that are not by the strongest motives and perswasives, so much as excited to zealous endeavours for the healing of our sad divisions; no nor some of them restrained from the passionate prosecution of their increase.

If yet any Papist, believing such false Histories as [*the Image of both Churches*] doth contain, or really finding any Protestants culpable, shall say, that we are as bad as they in wars or cruelty, and that *Iliacos intra muros peccatur & extra*. I again reply, 1. That true History and experience tells the world, that there is no comparison between their excessive cruelties and ours. 2. Yet it is none of my desire or intent, to defend any person or people that have been truly guilty in the least degree. 3. Our doctrine is against that which theirs doth own. 4. If either our Doctrine or practice have been amiss, we desire reproof and information, and are willing to reform them. The Word of God being our only Rule, if it appear that we have in any point misunderstood it, we desire nothing more than to be rectified, and then we shall confess our former faults before the world, and promise reformation. For our Principles fix us not in Sin or Errour. But the Papists are fixed in their Errours, and think there is a necessity lyeth on them never to amend. Now the Pope and a General Council hath already decreed that the Pope may depose Princes, and Absolve their subjects, and give their Lands to others, to amend this abominable errour,

is,

is, with them, to give away all their cause, and to cease to be Papists. So that all Princes and People must necessarily despair of their amendment. But of this whole subject I refer the Reader to *Henry Fowlis*, a most bitter reviler of the Presbyterians, but the Author of such a Collection of the treasonable doctrines and practises of the Papists, as was never before published.

CHAP. I.

Some Proposals for a (hopeless) Peace.

IT is a Defensive conflict that I have been hitherto managing. This work is put upon us by our adversaries. But in the conclusion I will add a few words of that which enticeth by its amiable aspect, and which we gladly follow, without importunity or constraint. And were our *Power* but answerable to our *Desires*, we would soon put an end to these contentions of the Church, without the hurt of any of the Dissenters. Yea did there appear but any considerable *Hopes* of success, I should venture to be more large in Proposals to that end. But when wiser men, of greater interest can do no good, and the case appeareth as next to desperate, a few words may suffice to satisfie my own conscience, and to please my mind with the mention of a Peace, and to help some others to right Dispositions and Desires, though we have never so little expectation of success.

And in order to what follows, I must first desire every Reader rightly to understand the meaning and design of all that I have hitherto said. It is but to be a necessary help to the Discovery of the Truth, and the confutation

confutation of the contrary errours, and the juſt defence of the doctrine of Chriſt, and of his Churches. I ſolemnly proteſt that it is none of my deſign or deſire, 1. To make any believe that the Difference is wider between us and the Papiſts than indeed it is. Nay I am ſatisfied that in many doctrinal points it is not ſo great as commonly it is taken to be by many, if not moſt, on both ſides: as in the points of Certainty of Salvation, of Pardon, of Juſtification, of Works, of Faith; and in almoſt all the controverſies about Predeſtination, Redemption, Free-will, the work of Grace, *&c.* The Dominicans in ſence agree with the Calviniſts (as they call them,) and the Jeſuites with the Lutherans and Arminians: and ſo in divers other points. The divers underſtanding of words among us, and the weakneſs and paſſions of Divines, and a baſe fear of the cenſures of a party, hath occaſioned many on both ſides to feign the differences to be much wider than indeed they are: ſo that when an *Alvarez*, a *Bannes*, a *Gibieuf*, have ſpoken the ſame things as the Proteſtants do, they are preſently fain to pour out abundance of unworthy ſlanders againſt the Proteſtants, for fear of being accounted Proteſtants themſelves. And to ſhew their party how much they differ from us, they muſt feign us to be monſters, and to hold that which commonly we abhor. And ſome Proteſtants are to blame alſo in ſome meaſure in this kind. This unchriſtian dealing will gripe the conſcience, when once it is awakened. Let me be rather numbred with thoſe that are ambitious to ſeem as Like to all the Churches of Chriſt, and as much to agree with them, as honeſtly and poſſibly I may, what party ſoever diſtaſte that union and agreement. And let my ſoul abhor the deſire of appearing more diſtant and diſagreeing than we are, what cenſures ſoever I may incur. Our ſtudents would not ſo ordinarily read

Aquinas,

Aquinas, *Scotus*, *Arminensis*, *Durandus*, &c. if there were not in them abundance of precious truth which they esteem. How near doth Dr. *Holden* come to us in the fundamental point of the Resolution of our faith? How near come the Scotists to us in sence, about the point of Merit? and *Waldensis* and others yet nearer. How near comes *Contarenus* to us (and many more) in the point of Justification? How near comes Cardinal *Cajetan* to us in the Liberty of dissenting from the Fathers in the Exposition of the Scriptures? and so doth *Maldonate* and many another. How near comes Cardinal *Cusanus* (*lib. de Concord.*) to us, even in the Essential point of difference, about the Original and Title that *Rome* hath to its supremacy? How near comes *Gerson* to us in the point of Venial and Mortal sin? perhaps as near as we are to our selves. How near come the Dominicans and Jansenians to the Calvinists in the points of Predestination, Grace and Free-will? For my own part, I scarce know a Protestant that my thoughts in these do more concur with, than they do with *Jansenius*, (that is indeed, with *Augustine* himself.) There are very few points of the Protestant doctrine, which I cannot produce some Papist or other to attest (and easily thus be even with Mr. *Brerely*, upon fairer terms than he deals with us.) As Bishop *Marton* in his *Apologie* and Dr. *Field* have fully proved by their own words.

2. I do also protest that it is none of my desire or design, to create any unjust Censures of the final state of Papists in any Readers: nor to perswade men that they are all damned, or that there are no honest godly men among them. When I read such writers as *Gerson*, *Barbanson*, *Ferus*, and others, I am fully satisfied that there are many among them (how many God only knows,) that truly fear God, and are sanctified gracious people, with whom I hope to dwell for ever. And

therefore I think it my Duty not only to forbear unjuſt Cenſures of them, but alſo to love them with that entire ſpecial Chriſtian Love by which Chriſt would have us known to be his Diſciples; and to perſwade all others to do the like. Though ſtill I am conſtrained to ſay, that in my ſmall acquaintance with them, I find no compariſon between the Engliſh Papiſts and our Churches in point of Holineſs. I would they were much better.

3. I do alſo proteſt that it is not my deſire or deſign to make any innocent Papiſt to be accounted guilty of the faults of others which he diſowns.

4. Nor is it any of my deſire or deſign to provoke the Magiſtrate to any cruelty or injuſtice towards them; nor to lay any penalty on them, but what is truly of neceſſity for the ſafety of himſelf and the Common-wealth, and a juſt reſtraint of them from perverting others, and doing miſchief to the ſouls of men, as I ſhall open more at large anon.

5. Nor is it any of my deſire or deſign to make the generality of them unjuſtly more odious with Rulers or People, than the meaſure of their corruptions do deſerve: Or to hide any of their vertues, or deprive them of any honour which is their due. This much my conſcience witneſſeth of my intents; though I know the partial will hardly believe it, when they feel themſelves ſmart by that Contradiction which they have made neceſſary for our own defence. And this I thought neceſſary to premiſe, before I lay down the following Propoſals, that prejudice and paſſion do not turn away mens eyes, or cauſe them to miſinterpret them. For it is prejudice, partiality, and faction, that hath hitherto fruſtrated all ſuch Propoſals and attempts.

CHAP.

CHAP. LI.

THere are five ſeveral Degrees of Peace which lye before us to be attempted between the Roman and Reformed Churches: We ſhall begin with the higheſt, and upon ſuppoſition of the failing of our Deſigns for that, come down to the next, and ſo to the Loweſt.

1. The firſt Degree of Peace to be Intended and Deſired is, *That we may ſo far Agree, as that we may hold perſonal Communion in the ſame Aſſemblies, in the worſhip of God, and live under the ſame particular Paſtors.*

2. If that cannot be attained, the next Degree deſirable is, *That we may hold a Catholick Chriſtian Communion in ſeveral Aſſemblies, under ſeveral Paſtors, acknowledging each other the true Churches of Chriſt, and joining in Synods when there is need, or at leaſt, giving each other, as Chriſtian Brethren, the right hand of Fellowſhip.*

3. If that may not be attained, the next Degree deſirable is, *That we may take one another for Chriſtians and Churches of Chriſt, though under ſuch corruptions as we think we are bound to diſown by denying the preſent exerciſe of Communion: as we do with particular Offendors, whom we only ſuſpend, but not condemn.*

4. If this much may not be had, but we will needs excommunicate each other abſolutely, the next Degree of Peace deſirable is, *That we may at leaſt ſo far regard the common truths that we are agreed upon, and the ſouls of the people, as to conſult on certain terms on which we may moſt peaceably manage our differences, with the leaſt hatred, and violence, and diſturbance of the Peace of Chriſtendom, and with the leaſt impediment to the general ſucceſs of thoſe common truths that we are all agreed in.*

5. If this may not be attained, the lowest Degree desirable is, *That at least we may take each other for more tolerable adversaries than Mahometans and Infidels are, and therefore may make a common Agreement to cease our wars and blood-shed, and turn all our Arms against the great and common enemy of the Christian name.*

Were it not for the Devil, and wicked minds, all these might be attained: but if men be not themselves incarnate Devils, we may expect the last. And understand that the terms of the lowest Degrees are all implyed in the Higher.

And now for the Highest and most desirable Degree of Peace, *viz.* That we may meet in the same Assemblies, under the same Pastors, there is so little probability that ever it should be accomplished, and withall, the various apprehensions of Christians doth make it so necessary to bear with one another in this, that I shall say but little of it, as knowing that I am like to lose my labour. Only this much concerning the terms,

If you will impose no more in point of Belief, as necessary to Salvation, but what is contained in the holy Scriptures, yea and in the three Creeds, and four first General Councils; and will leave the Pastors of the particular Churches to worship God according to the Rule of the holy Scriptures, prudentially themselves determining of meer Circumstances left to their determination, according to the general Rules, of Order, Decency, and Edification, and bearing with a difference herein according to the different state of the Churches or judgement of the Pastors, this is the only probable way to bring us to this highest degree of Peace. Though according to this course, men should be left to some liberty to joyn with what particular Congregation they see best, and so would most commonly joyn with those that are neareſt to their own

own judgement; yet the minds of most would be so mollified by mutual forbearance, and by being satisfied in the way that is thus commonly agreed on, that they would not scruple to joyn with one another in worship in the several Assemblies.

And here I shall further add, that if these terms cannot be yielded to, yet all that will yield to the terms of the next Degree of Peace, may be admitted *into our Assemblies*, though we cannot joyn with them in theirs. For the Papists have much more in the *Manner* of their worship to keep *us* back, than we have in *ours* to keep them back. For *their* errours lie in *Excess*, and they suppose *ours* to lie but in *Defect*. Now Conscience may well yield to perform one part of a duty when it cannot perform the rest: But it can never yield to commit one actual sin, by doing what is forbidden by God. *E. 6.* If the Papists think that we sinfully omit the Sacrament of extream unction, they may nevertheless be present at the Sacrament of Baptism. If they think we preach not all the truth that we ought, they may nevertheless hear and receive that which we do preach. But in their Assemblies we must do those positive actions which our Consciences tell us are sins against God. And therefore unless they will yield (as they will not,) to the abovementioned terms, we cannot joyn in their Assemblies; but upon the terms in the next Chapter we can admit them into ours.

But if the Churches have not a necessary Liberty in this, they will never agree, but be still breaking into pieces, or persecuting one another, to force men to joyn with such Assemblies as best please them that bear the Sword. Though we readily grant that to hear and learn the principles of Religion, and submit to the state and duty of Catechumens, men may with less inconvenience be forced, and ordinarily should so be.

CHAP. LII.

THe ſecond Degree of Peace deſirable, below the former, is, *That if we cannot live under the ſame particular Paſtors, and joyn in the ſame Aſſemblies; yet we may hold a diſtant Catholick Communion in ſeveral Aſſemblies, without condemning or perſecuting one another, and may afford the ſpecial Love of Chriſtians to each other.*

This will not be done as long as we take each other for Hereticks; and therefore the cauſes of thoſe cenſures muſt be removed, partly by a nearer Agreement in our Principles, and partly by a greater Moderation in our Cenſures of one another. And this a man would think among Chriſtians might be obtained. The terms on which it muſt be had are theſe.

Suffer us to confine our ſelves in Worſhip and Church-government to the Word of God, and the Determination of our particular Churches or Paſtors about meer Circumſtantials left to their determination; and do you confine your ſelves accordingly, not extending your practice beyond the Canons of the four firſt General Councils, and the reſt called [Canones Eccleſiæ Univerſalis,] (*publiſhed by* Juſtellus, Tillius, *or the* Codex Dionyſii Exigui:) *and for matters of Faith, we will all profeſs to receive the Scripture, and what ever is contained in the ſaid Councils and the three Creeds, and to inſiſt upon no more as neceſſary.* And on theſe terms we may live in Love as Brethren.

Here note, 1. That in matter of Faith we will not be bound to take more than is in the Scripture, and yet we will take all as aforeſaid that is in the Creeds, becauſe we are perſwaded that there is no more than is in the Scripture.

Scripture. 2. We will not tie each other to profeſs on what Grounds we receive the Doctrine of theſe Creeds and Councils. If you receive it as Tradition ſuperadded to Scripture, and if we receive it as being the ſame with Scripture Doctrine, or a meet Expoſition of it, we will leave each other in this without examination to their liberty, as long as it is the ſame things that we believe. 3. In matters of *Worſhip and Government* we may not be *compelled* to take in all that is in all theſe Councils; but only we will promiſe *not to go beyond them*, and take in any more, and ſo ſhall you: ſo that if ſome of us confine our ſelves to the *Holy Scripture*, and others will go further, as far as all thoſe Canons do extend; we will yield to live as Brethren in Chriſtian Love, and forbear the cenſuring of one another. And herein you may well condeſcend to us, when in many things you have caſt off the Canons of thoſe Councils your ſelves; and abundance of them concern not our times or Countries; and ſo many of your own Writers confeſs, that all things neceſſary to Salvation are in the Scriptures, and that Canons are mutable, and Churches may vary in theſe leſſer things.

CHAP. LIII.

COuld the former terms of Peace be yielded to, it would be happy for the Churches; and I am perswaded were it not for the *Italians*, the *French* would yield to them. And some Protestants will go further, and yield to *Rome* that if Papists will confine their Faith, and Government, and Worship but to those limits as the *Greeks*, *Armenians*, *Ethiopians*, &c. do, they will readily hold this Catholick Communion with them. But then we must still remember, 1. That we will not be bound to approve of all that they do. 2. Nor shall they go about to force all others to rise up to their pitch; nor to silence and cast out all those Ministers that will not go beyond the Scriptures. You shall bear with all that will be Ruled by the Scripture, and we will bear with all that will not go beyond the said General Councils, or *Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ universalis*: yea, and admit such to our Society and Assemblies.

But now supposing that *Rome* will not yield to this (though methinks *France* and other Nations may do it without them,) the next Degree desirable is, that [*At least we may take one another for Christians, and Churches that have such corruptions, as yet leave us good hopes of the salvation of multitudes; though we suppose salvation more rare and difficult where those corruptions are, than where they are not, and though we are forced to suspend that Communion with such, which with sound members we should hold.*]

And indeed the obtaining of this much Peace, requireth no more but Christian Charity conducted by a right understanding of each other. And for my part I have

have already this much peace with the Church of *Rome*, and so have many millions more of Protestants as well as I: and I think the generality of them. But *Rome* hath not so much Charity for us. But we shall not answer nor be condemned for other mens uncharitableness. I need not therefore propose any means for that peace which we have already attained to, or may if we will. But then let this be accompanyed by the following forbearances.

CHAP. LIV.

THe fourth Degree of Peace desirable, whether the last mentioned be attained or not, is, [*That we may so far lay by our hatred, wrath, and striving about the Controverted points, as to consult together of the terms on which we may manage our differences with the least disturbance to the Peace of Christendom, and the least disadvantage to the Truths that we are agreed in, and to the peoples souls.*]

Religious Reason must needs confess the Reasonableness of this proposal in the General: But all the difficulty lyeth in the particulars. If you ask me what the particular terms are on which we should agree, I answer, There are many at hand, that Reason must needs approve of; but because there is no likelyhood of accepting them, I shall spare the labour of proposing them. And the rather, because when we have much ado to agree on this much among our selves, or the Papists among themselves, with what hope can we move that the Agreement should be Universal? But this much I may propose, 1. *That a Consultation of the Agents of Christian Princes and Divines might do much to further such a thing. And till that*

that can be had, some few of the more Peaceable Princes and Divines should lead the way, and give the rest a good example. 2. *And that an Universal Liberty of Conscience, with necessary restrictions, might be a probable way.*

Where note, 1. That it is an *Universal Liberty* only that we move for, or at least *on equal terms.* It is not that the Papists may have *Liberty in England*, and we have none in *Spain* and *other Countries.* The Author of the *Image of both Churches* maketh a long and subtile perswasive for *Liberty of Conscience:* But where would he have it? Let them take this equal motion, and yield to it if they dare, Let the Protestants have liberty in *Italy, Spain, Flanders, Portugal, Austria, Bavaria,* &c. and we shall consent that the Papists have as much Liberty in *England, Holland, Sweden, Denmark,* &c. But it must in reason be *on equal terms.* Yet this advantage we know they have, that their Agents and Missionaries are incomparably more *numerous* than ours, by reason of the multitude of their Fryars, Jesuites, &c. and their doctrines are more suitable to corrupted nature, and carnal interest, and the people are more engaged by worldly obligations to their wayes: And yet we are so confident of the Power of Truth, that I would this Proposal were accepted. The Bible it self without any Preachers, would shrewdly shake the Kingdom of the Pope, where men have liberty to use it.

2. The limitations of this Liberty are, 1. That one party have no more of it than the other. 2. That it extend not to allow a disturbance of Ministers and Churches in Gods Worship, nor any unpeaceable tumultuary proceedings. 3. That no Party be tolerated under this pretence, to teach any thing against the Essentials or Necessary points that we are agreed on, nor any thing that is against the peace of the Com-

mon-

mon-wealth, or lives, or dignities of the Governours thereof.

Two parties among our selves will dislike this proposal. 1. Some will say, *If Liberty be desirable, why may not we grant it in* England, *though* Spain, Italy, *&c. will not?*

Answ. This Liberty is *not Desirable for it self*, but as a means to that end which is so Desirable. And therefore it is no further desirable than it tendeth to that end. And a partial Toleration of them, that tolerate not us, is so far from being such a means, as that it is the next way to destroy the end that we desire: it will but put our necks under their feet, and open our bosoms to their Swords, and so make our desired Peace impossible. No friend of the Gospel and Reformed Churches will prosecute that motion.

2. Others will say, *It is unlawful to grant such a Liberty to Papists, because it is false doctrine which they will preach, and Idolatry which they will exercise; and we must not do evil that good may come by it.*

Answ. We may do no evil; but we may omit that which at another time is a duty, in a season when it is no duty. To punish such offenders is a positive duty, which at all times is not a duty, but unseasonably performed is a sin. For a Magistrate therefore to punish such offenders, when it apparently tendeth to hinder the progress of the Gospel, and overthrow the peace and safety of the Christian State, is not a Duty, but a sin. Would any of these Objectors be against a Magistrates releasing of a Jesuite out of Prison, in exchange for a faithful Minister of the Gospel, especially of many; as prisoners are commonly exchanged in war? If not, why should they be against the releasing of such a man to higher ends, even to save mens souls? To *give Liberty* is but to *Permit*, or *not to Hinder*; or *not to Punish*: and therefore

fore is but the *not-doing* of a work when it is unſeaſonable, (as Sacrifice is when God requireth Mercy.) And he that may *permit*, or *forbear to puniſh*, may on a juſt reaſon *promiſe ſo to do*. So that this is but forbearing the puniſhing of Papiſts, when we cannot puniſh them without the exceeding hurt of the Church, and wrong to many thouſand ſouls.

But I know I ſpeak all this in vain; for the Pope will never conſent that Proteſtants ſhall ſow their ſeed at *Rome*, leſt it quickly unneaſt him. But in the mean time let the Papiſts here confeſs, if they be reaſonable, that we have no reaſon to give Liberty to them, that will give none to us, or upon unequal terms. If they claim a ſpecial Title to it, as having the juſter cauſe, we deſire no more than a fair tryal of that, and let them that have the juſter cauſe take all.

3. Another particular that ſhould here be agreed on is this, (whether the former be conſented to or not;) *that on both ſides where the Teachers have any Toleration or forbearance, they may be forced by the Magiſtrate to teach the Ignorant people that adhere to them, the great Articles of the Chriſtian faith (both words and ſenſe,) which we are all agreed in.* Which was Biſhop *Uſhers* motion to the Papiſt Prieſts in *Ireland*. *For* ſaith he, *among the Papiſts the people are ſuffered to periſh for want of knowledge; the vulgar ſuperſtitions of Popery not doing them half that hurt, that the ignorance of thoſe common principles of faith doth, which all true Chriſtians are bound to learn.* (*Serm. at* Wanſted, page 33.)

4. Another neceſſary particular to be agreed on is, *that we uſe not bitter invectives againſt each other, nor uncharitable contendings; eſpecially in the ears of the ignorant people that have not yet learned the common truths which we agree in: but that our Debates be*

managed

managed only in such Assemblies as are capable of them, and in a sober Christian way.

5. Another is, *that such Magistrates that will not grant Toleration, may yet on both sides avoid cruelties, and inflict no more penalties for matters of meer Religious worship, than necessity shall require: and that herein they may agree upon some equality in the several Nations.* And in this let *Spain*, *Italy*, *Austria*, and the rest, for shame consent to be as moderate as the Turk, and to shut up the doors of their bloody Inquisition.

6. Let us all agree *to renounce all Treachery and unfaithfulness against the Soveraign Powers, and all seditious disturbances of the Peace of Common-wealths.*

7. *Let those afford us the common Love of men, that think us not capable of the special Love of Christians:* and so let us Love our Neighbours as our selves, and study to do good, and not hurt to one another; and give over plotting to undermine one another, and destroy one anothers civil interest, and get our Neighbours under our feet. This much well practised, would do something to the peace of the Christian world.

CHAP. LV.

THe loweſt Degree, that none but incarnate Devils one would think should resist, is this; that if we will needs live as enemies, *yet we may remember that we have all greater enemies; and therefore let us give over our wars, and let every Nation be quietly governed by their own Laws and Soveraigns, and let us all join together against the common enemies of Christ.*

We cannot but know that much of Christs interest lyeth in our hands, and that if either party were devoured by the Turk, it would be a heavy blow to the Christian

ſtian cauſe. If God ſhould ſuffer that proud enemy to come and make a third among us, to end our quarrels, we muſt juſtifie him in his judgements; and muſt to our perpetual ſhame confeſs, that by our proud and paſſionate contendings, and unpeaceableneſs, and ſelf-ſeeking, we did betray the Chriſtian cauſe. O wonderful ſtupidity and impiety of Great men, and Learned men, profeſſing ſo much zeal for God, that they can no more agree, nor bear in Love and Compaſſion with each other, nor ceaſe their wars, when a raging potent enemy ſtands over them, ready to devour them both! Let the *Venetians* take the honour, and we the ſhame: However their own Intereſt may engage them, yet materially their wars are more honourable than ours. The Pope is eager for a General Peace among his ſubjects, that they may be ſtrengthened to devour us: But it were an honeſter deſign, that would give him more comfort at laſt, to mediate a Peace among all Chriſtians, that in this at leaſt they might be one, to oppoſe the Turk, and reſcue the Heritage of Chriſt, which he hath oppreſſed.

And O what a bleſſed thing it were, if the Jeſuites, Fryars and Proteſtants could but agree, to join together for the converſion of the poor Indians! And either preach in the ſame, or ſeveral Countries, without ſeeking the deſtruction there of one another; yea and afford each other help: that the Engliſh, Hollanders, and others might ſend Preachers as well as Merchants into the Indies, and we might there contribute our endeavours to propagate the Goſpel, though in our different wayes; not envying, hating and hindering each other, but remembring we all confeſs one Chriſt, though not one Vice-Chriſt.

Concluſion.

I Have caſt out theſe Propoſals meerly to acquaint the peaceable Chriſtian, what he ſhould deſire, that the frame of his heart may be right before God: and not with any expectation that they ſhould be ſo regarded as to procure what they drive at. I am not ſo weak, or ignorant of the inconſiderableneſs of the Propoſer, or of the ſelfiſhneſs and ungodlineſs of the world. But yet I may lawfully take the comfort of the moſt uneffectual deſires and endeavours that are honeſt.

And for thoſe that would have us Reconciled upon the *Grotian* terms, or upon the French Foundation of a General Council, and would have all forced to come over to their way, and deny Liberty to the reſt, that cannot thus cloſe with them; and all that think that the Church muſt have ſome Viſible Head, or Soveraign to unite in, I ſhall ſhew them their errour in a diſtinct Diſputation, which I am publiſhing next to this, as a ſupplement: and therein I ſhall give them ſuch further Propoſals for a juſt Reconciliation, as men that are Studious of Peace may proſecute, with hope of ſome ſucceſs.

And becauſe I have lately met with a Paper called [*An Explanation of the Roman Catholick Belief,*] &c. which pretendeth to much moderation, in divers points; I purpoſe next to enquire, Whether it mean as it pretends? that if it do, we may give it welcome; if nor, we may detect its Fraud: For as I ſhould much rejoice to hear of ſo much amendment of the Roman Belief, which I thought had been ſuppoſed by themſelves to be incorrigible; ſo I muſt confeſs that I am ſo much for plain and open dealing, that I think it my duty to help to bring their works into the Light, and try how they agree with the Truth and among themſelves; that men may judge of them as they are. *FINIS.*